
Imprimatur,

Liber cui Titulus [*Anti-Cotton.*]

Nov. 2.
1688.

Hen. Maurice, RR. in Christo
P. D. *Wilhelmo* Archiep. Cant.
& Sacr.

MICROFILMED—1976

Imprimatur,

Liber cui Titulus [*Anti-Cotton.*]

Nov. 2.
1688.

Hen. Maurice, RR. in Christo
P. D. *Wilhelmo* Archiep. Cant.
a Sacr.

MICROFILMED—1976

ANTI-COTTON:

OR, A
REFUTATION
OF
COTTON's Letter Declaratory;

Lately directed to the

Queen Regent
of **FRANCE;**

And Apologizing for the **JESUITS** touching the Doctrine of Killing **KINGS**.

Proving that the **JESUITS** were the Authors of that Execrable Parricide, sometime committed upon the Person of the French King, **HENRY** the Fourth.

Together with a Supplication of the University of *Paris*, against the Jesuits opening Schools amongst them.

To which is added a Large New Preface and Postscript, fully proving the Doctrine of Murdering Kings to be the Jesuits Doctrine, and vindicating *Anti-Cotton* from all Objections.

He that changeth his Religion is the likeliest to make a Traytor. Jo. Dryden's Notes on the Emperess of *Morocco*.

LONDON:

Printed, and are to be Sold by *Randall Taylor*, near Stationers-Hall. **MDC LXXXIX.**

A NT I - C OT T O N :

O R , A

R E F U T A T I O N

O F

C OT T O N ' s L e t t e r D e c l a r a t o r y ;

L a t e l y d i r e c t e d t o t h e

Q u e e n R e g e n t

o f F R A N C E ;

A n d A p o l o g i z i n g f o r t h e J E S U I T S t o u c h -
i n g t h e D o c t r i n e o f K i l l i n g K I N G S .

P r o v i n g t h a t t h e J E S U I T S w e r e t h e A u t h o r s o f t h a t E x -
c r u e l P a r t i c i d e , f o r t i m e s c o m m i t t e d u p o n t h e P e r s o n o f t h e
F r e n c h K i n g , H E N R Y t h e T e n t h .

T o g e t h e r w i t h a S u p p l i c a t i o n o f t h e U n i v e r s i t y o f P a r i s , a g a i n s t
t h e J e s u i t s o p e n i n g S c h o o l s a m o n g t h e m .

T o w h i c h i s a d d e d a L a r g e N e w P r e f a c e a n d P o s t f a c e f u l l y p r o -
v i n g t h e D o c t r i n e o f M u r d e r i n g K i n g s t o b e t h e J e s u i t s D o c t r i n e
a n d v i n d i c a t i n g N e w - C o n t r a n f r o m a l l O b j e c t i o n s .

H e t h a t c h a n g e d h i s R e l i g i o n i s t h e l i g h t t o m a k e a T r a n s l a t i o n f o r D i s t r i b u t i o n
N o t e s o n t h e E m p i r e s o f M o n e c o .

L O N D O N :

P r i n t e d , a n d a r e t o b e s o l d b y R a n d a l l T y l e r , n e a r S t .
t o w e r s - H a l l . M D C L X X I X .

THE
PREFACE.

WHETHER the Church of Rome, in its diffusive latitude, be justly chargeable with Doctrines prejudicial to Civil Government, or not, has been the subject of some late Disputes; how strong and convincing their arguments have been, who have endeavoured to prove her guilty, or how weak and unsuccessful the attempts of those whose study it hath been to vindicate her, the most impartial will be the best judg; especially when he considers, that on the one side have been alleg'd the Decrees of Councils, acknowledg'd by themselves to be General, the Authoritative Acts of Popes founded on such Decrees, Rebellious practices pursuant to those Acts, and at last Cononization made by the Holy and Apostolick See, the reward and encouragement of such practices: Whereas those of the other side, instead of clearing themselves, have been content to oppose to all these, nothing more than the personal Loyalty of some of that Communion, or (what has been more insisted on as a just reply) some subtle evasions and nice distinctions betwixt matters of Faith and Practice, of Doctrine and Discipline; betwixt what is necessarily received, and what is problematical only.

I shall not at present insist upon this subject in the general extent thereof, which has already been managed with so

great

Quod Com-
muni consensu
Doctores va-
riis in locis &
temporibus
docent id Ec-
clesia universa
sentire & do-
cere consuevit.
Bellar. de ex-
cusat. Barclaii
cap. 3. p. 832.

great reason and success; but only revive what our Fathers thought both of the principles and practices of the Jesuits, who, tho as a particular Society they have rules pecutiar to themselves, have yet hitherto been acknowledg'd by all to be the genuine Sons of the Church of Rome, and do make up at this day a very considerable part of those that are stiled Guides and Luminaries in it; such as have both commission and authority to instruct and teach the people, and therefore the Church it self cannot but in some measure be entitled to all those dangerous and bloody Tenets, which the Jesuits have not been ashamed publickly to profess and own in the generality of their Writings, which as they always submitted to the judgment of the Church so they could not have been published, and much less put in execution, without the approbation, or at least the permission and connivance of the Governours of it; from whence I shall take leave to infer, that the Loyalty of the Church in which such Doctrines have been taught with allowance, is not so indisputable as those who call themselves Catholicks would have it.

If we look back upon this Order of Men in the years that are past, and reflect how both in our own and neighbouring Nations, they have treated Princes that are gone, we shall have too much reason to suspect their pretentions to Loyalty at present, or to expect any safety from them for the future; yea, tho they should never so loudly, like other Criminals, plead Not guilty at the Bar, and with all appearance of sincerity detest those pernicious doctrines, yet even such protestations would render them suspicious, and induce all that know their methods and devices, to believe that 'tis not want of will, but opportunity only, that keeps them quiet and in subjection to an Established Government; when the Constitutions thereof are not favourable to them.

The Author of these following Papers, was (as appears by his own Assertion) a Roman Catholick; (and, as we are told,

The Preface.

iii

told, a considerable man in his Order) one of their own Religion, and therefore most unlikely to speak what was not true concerning them, and one that wrote of those actions and passages which were done and transacted in his own time, and therefore could not be ignorant of the certainty or circumstances of them; most of them have been confirmed by other Authors of approved credit; several of them were confess'd by the Malefactors themselves; and those upon which the greatest stress is laid in making good the charge against the Jesuits, were drawn out of the Arrests of the Parliament of Paris, and were the grounds and occasion of those Judgments and Decrees of the Court against them.

But that the subject in hand may be better understood, it will be convenient here to shew the occasion of writing these Papers, and it may not be impertinent also to mention some of those passages, which our Author (for what reason we know not) has omitted in his Answer to the Declaratory Letter.

1. It is well known that after the execrable Parricide committed upon the Person of King Henry the 4th. of France, the Doctors of the Sorbon assembled in Convocation, did solemnly condemn a Book written by John Mariana a Spanish Jesuit, for maintaining in it the lawfulness of Murthering or Assassinating of Kings or Tyrants, which Book was thereupon also condemned by arrest of Parliament, and sentenc'd to be burnt by the hands of the common Executioner, before the great Gate of the Palace; which Book Father Cotton had formerly been requested by the late King to answer, but, for reasons best known to the Society, he would not then gratifie him, and desired to be excused; but now, understanding that 'twas given out that the rest of the Jesuits generally maintained the same doctrine, and consequently all such writings of theirs did equally deserve to undergo the same condemnation, so that partly to stifle this rumour, and partly the other which was then spread abroad, of his Society's being concern'd

in

The Preface.

in the late inhumane Murder of their King, or else to compound for not answering Mariana; this Father being a man magnified by the order as Praecheer and Confessor to the late King, and an entire Master of his affections, thought himself oblig'd as well for his own as brethrens safety, forthwith to disown Mariana's doctrine, and to produce some testimonies from their Authors, which might seem to maintain the contrary opinion; and lastly, to set down some articles relating to this point, which his Society (as he pretended) would stand to; all which he did in a Declaratory Letter dedicated to the Queen Regent.

In answer to which Letter soon appear'd this Anti-Cotton, which endeavours to prove against the Father, That the said Jesuits did not only by their doctrines, which were maintained and spread abroad make way to the execrable Murder, but that they were themselves also the secret Actors and Contrivers of it: the very sight of this small Treatise (as we are credibly inform'd, so griev'd this Father, that it even wrung tears from his eyes; being sensible, 'tis likely, of that great damage it might bring to his Order, and of the occasion which he himself had justly given for its publication; for personal imputations, the truer they are, the deeper impressions they always make.

2. Nor was it by this Author alone, that they were charged with it, or then only; but were before, under and after their banishment complain'd of as Incendiaries and Poysoners of France, and such as both in Practice and Doctrine were dangerous to the State, as may be seen at large in an eloquent Oration of a Roman Catholick, to the most Christian King, made in the time of their banishment, against their re-admission, wherein he quotes a character of them out of the Sorbon Degree, That they were fitter to destroy than to edify, and such as would create many troubles, and greatly annoy temporal Princes; and brings in one of the many Lawyers

Erat: de Jesu-
itis in Regno
Galliae non re-
cipiendis.

Translated
1679.

The Preface

Lawyers that pleaded against them, An. 1564. prophetically declaring those grand evils and mischiefs they should bring upon that nation in after times, he urges besides the supplication of the University of Paris, An. 1594. and the Petition of the Estates of France about the same time to the Parliament against them: and plainly avers, that all the true Servants and good Subjects of the King were highly offended with them; that they were esteem'd by the best Politicians and greatest Assemblies of the Land, not only as cruel in their Counsels, but also as favourers of Foreign enterprizes, and such as did endeavour to betray that Kingdom to the interest and Power of Spain. The same Author also informs us, 'Twas observable, that betwixt the years 1589. and 1594. not so much as one Jesuit acted or express'd any thing that could be serviceable either to his King or Country, but were always restless in subverting of the government, and imbroyling of the Kingdom; so that every one, whom they had not infected with their principles, wish'd an utter extirpation of them; they endeavoured all they could to imbue the people, by seditious Libels and treasonable discourses, with the belief of those wicked assertions; That the King might be Excommunicated by the Pope; That he was no King but a Tyrant; and that they were freed from the Oath of Allegiance; which was in effect, to make him but a Vice-Roy to Rome, and his Kingdom wholly to depend upon the good or ill will of him that should be elected by the Cardinals: They pretended their Religion to be in danger, and therefore sent large complaints to Popish Princes against their King, and desired their assistance to destroy him; they declared their obedience to be but conditional, whereupon they renounced their Allegiance to him, and never left till they had contriv'd, attempted, and at last procured his death. But,

That their main design was to establish the exorbitant power of the Pope, appears from their zealous contests with
the

Truth defended p. 54.

Ibid. Orat. ad Reg.

the old Sorbonists about the validity of this very excommunication; wherein the grave Doctors, who had constantly denied that Doctrine, were out-voted and overpowered by the young Students of this hopeful Society, notwithstanding the matter they contended for was directly against the received word of God, and the Ancient and standing Maxims of France. And further, to show that they espoused it cordially, they were so far from denying it, when 'twas objected against them as a dangerous Doctrine, that in their Defence to Arnould's plea, they pertinaciously adhered to it, and endeavour'd to maintain this common Extravagant: If the Pope does ill, or undertakes more than he ought, men however are bound to obey, and God only can judge him; so that if he fulminates the most Christian King, it is absolutely forbidden any to find fault therewith; yea and if it pleaseth him he must be deposed, and another established in his room.

'Tis moreover to be remembred, that in the many Petitions made (during exile) for their return, scarce any of them mention'd, much less denied, this dangerous and unchristian Doctrine. 'Twas their peculiar talent to pass over that great point, and to talk at a distance concerning it, or at least to let those objections he quater that were unanswerable; though the Secular Authority had censur'd and condemn'd their opinions, yet they generally gloried in them, and would not be perswaded to disown them, unless it were upon the apprehension of some imminent danger, or by virtue of a dispensation from their General and Catechists; and those famous remonstrances that were made, and amendments that were promised, were only in order to involve themselves into the affections of the Prince, and to impose upon his credulity; for they were follow'd and perform'd with those servile attempts upon his Person, and at last requir'd by an inhumane butchery: which was sufficient to convince all men not only of the validity

of their promises, and the gratitude of that Party, but also that there is never wanting a will in a Jesuit to do mischief; this was their character and reputation at that time, and I am afraid the succeeding generation has had little reason hitherto (notwithstanding their pretended reformati-
 ons) to alter their opinions of them.

Besides these mentioned, most of the books which were written in that age by the Fathers of this Society, were filled with this Doctrine; our Author has given a brief account of some of them; but 'twas impossible to comprehend in so short a discourse the hundredth part of what they have writ upon this subject. Emanuel Sa. in his book of Aphorisms, on the words Confessor, Princeps, Tyrannus, has given us an Epitome of the whole Doctrine of Rebellion; he plainly declares; That a Confessor is bound to conceal any Treason or Murder intended against the Person of the King. That a lawful Prince may be deposed upon Mal-administration, by the majority or consent of the people; and that a Tyrant may be dispatched by any particular person. To which if we add that which is quoted by this Author concerning the exemption of the Clergy, we have then a compleat Abridgment of all the principles of Treason. What this Author says is the more considerable, because it was the result of forty years Study, which were spent in compiling this Book; and though divers of these Maxims were expung'd in a Second Edition yet it was not because they ceased to be Maxims, but because they were become inexpedient, and the times would not bear them. O blessed State, and noble security of Princes, who are so happy as to depend upon Loyalty of such Confessors, upon the will of the Mob, and mercy of any Private Assassin! For though their rights are never so indisputable, and they never so absolute in the possession of them, but a small piece of Parchment from his Holiness may quite vacate their Authority; and one ill name put upon them by these men, may

more easily and securely effect their ruin, than the greatest Army of their adversaries; so that like Damocles, all the safety of their lives hangs but on the strength of one single thread; and the quiet and settlement of their Kingdoms depend but upon the will and pleasure, in effect, of every bo-headed Zealot.

'Twould be endless to go on and recount all the abettors of this opinion: it was long since observ'd by the Translator of this book, that though Father Cotton undertook to prove from the testimony of Becanus, that the Jesuits do not all agree with Mariana in the King-killing doctrine, yet we shall find in that very place quoted by him, that he approves of Mariana's Doctrine in express terms, and not only so, but owns it likewise to be the common Tenet of the Jesuits; his words are these, *Atque hæc est expressa sententia Johannis Marianæ loco citatæ & aliorum Jesuitarum, qui hac de rescripserunt, in qua non video quid Calvinistæ possunt merito reprehendere; And this is the express opinion of John Mariana, as also of the other Jesuits who have writ concerning this matter. Nor do I see what fault the Calvinists can justly find with it. Here we have a specimen of the Fathers sincerity in citing Authors, and may discern what hard shifts a Jesuit is put to, to defend his Loyalty, when even his own witnesses do prove him guilty. We see also, that Mariana is not (as the Jesuits pretend) the only Author of that Order that has taught this doctrine, but that his opinion is approv'd by Becanus, and other learned Jesuits; and that among them 'tis downright Calvinism and Heresie to deny it.*

The like also has been observed from Gregory deValentia, whom Father Cotton cites to prove it to be in no case lawful to make an assault upon the Person of the Prince, though he should abuse his Authority never so much; whereas it is manifest that the said Gregory was of a quite contrary opinion,

opinion, for in the same place by him cited, after some distinctions made betwixt a Tyrant by Administration and a Tyrant by Usurpation, he hath these words, De primo eadem est ratio ac de aliis Malefactoribus, qui solum per publicam potestatem puniri possunt; of a Tyrant in the first sense there is the same reason as of other Malefactors, who can be punished only by publick Authority: so that Gregory makes Princes, when for some Male-administration they are reputed Tyrants, obnoxious to temporal punishments like other Malefactors, though they have never so just a title to their Crowns; and how this punishment can be inflicted without violence to their persons, we must desire Father Cotton's Indicator, when he has ears, to inform us.

But that under which this Father and his fellows, in their many and long contests with the University of Paris, chiefly shelter'd themselves against the charge of maintaining unreasonable Doctrines, was, that they profess'd always to adhere to that Loyal Decree of the Council of Constance, which condemns this proposition as impious and heretical, Quilibet Tyrannus potest & debet licite & meritorie occidi, per quemcumque vassallum suum vel subditum, etiam per clanculares insidias &c. Non expectata sententia vel mandato cuiuscunque iudicis.

That 'tis lawful or meritorious for any subject or vassal to kill a Tyrant, or privately to circumvent or lay wait for him, having sworn Allegiance to him, without staying for the command and sentence of the Judge. But against this poor pretence of owning this Decree, we have these things to object: 1. That they produce some Authors to assert, that the doctrine of the Hussites was the occasion of this Canon made against the killing of Tyrants: yet, as Anti-Cotton has rightly observ'd, there is nothing more plain from the French History of the life of Charles the 7th. than that Gerson's proposition to the Council, and from

Sess. 15.

p. 55. 56.

this very Canon he felt, that the occasion thereof was the Doctrine of Jo. Pett a Doctor of the Sorbon, who affirmed it to be lawful for a private person either by words or strokes to kill a subject that rises up against his King, which he felt he calls a Tyrant, thereby descending to justify the murder committed by Jo. Duke of Burgundy upon the Person of Lewis Duke of Orleans, who in those propositions of Pett was unjustly call'd a Tyrant; and therefore that while the Council principally intended to condemn, was this that it was lawful for a private man to slay one of the King's subjects without any form of Law, under this colour, that some call him Tyrant, or because he goes about to trouble the State, or is disobedient to the King: according to which sense it follows, that the safety of Princes is rather impaired, than provided for by that Canon, in not permitting their rebellious Subjects to be cut off any otherwise, than other Malefactors are; that is, only by the solemnity and formality of the Law. And yet,

P. 35.

P. 15.

Vid. Greg. de
Valen. T. 3.
disp. 5, 8, 9.
p. 3.

2. Besides all this, should the Canon be understood in their own sense, it will not secure them: for after excommunication they are no longer Princes, according to their own Doctrine, as this Author observes, but are reduc'd to the state and condition of private men, and may be dealt withall as such: accordingly James Clement was not safe to be guilty of murdering the King, but only of executing a heinous malefactor. The greatest reason, you see, may be committed without offending against this Canon, for according to the known and common language of the Jesuits, it implies only, that no Tyrant (that is a lawful Prince ruling Tyrannically) ought Legally to be slain, by any one of his Subjects or Vassals, by any clancular means, being sworn to him, without sentence or command of some Judge, or his superior. Though the Niceties of those men in this case might inform us how unwilling they are to part with this their beloved

act; ;

to them, yet well had find many more workmen and faithful
people to the Order, in the present distress; and said said
highness and sublimity in their expectations about your ship
darken their meaning. No remedy can be made to order of
Christ. For instance, they may understand in the Father's Pa-
sons would have the Oath of Allegiance to be for the King,
it may conflict with the good and safety of Holy Church, or
so long as the Pope shall not interpose, we may say nothing to
the contrary, nor then may put it off by saying, it is a
matter of Fact, or Right, between Power and us, medi-
ate, immediate or immediate, ordinary or extraordinary,
primary or secondary, and many other arguments of the same
kind.

13. *It is not all part of doubt, if we may believe Cardinal Bellarmine, there is very little credit given by them to this Council. Nam cum in Concilio tunc nullus esset Pontifex corpus id erat sine capite, neq; res ad fidem pertinentes non aliud quicquam majoris momenti decernere poterat. For, there being no Pope in it, was but as a Body without a Head, and therefore could not determine any matters of Faith, or any thing else that was of considerable moment. And also Martin the Fifth did afterward confirm the Decree for prohibition of Schism, such as was at that time declaring of the Pope, viz. yet what did relate to the Power or Right of Superiourity, could not be given away, and that he thought this to be a part of it, appears from his Decree, since it is thus worded, against Borelay and Gerson, wherein he under late has proved from Councils, (Councils standing this of Constantine) and from Scripture, that the Pope has Power, not only to Excommunicate and Depose temporal Princes, but also to excommunicate Subjects from Obedience, and to give them into a capacity of destroying him, (for as they had acknowledged the Pope as their Head, as they did at the Council of Constance) and therefore that the Councils were not*

Resp. ad Anonym. confid.
8vo. p. 1073.
&c.

1951. 10. 1. 10. 1. 10. 1.

De excusar.
Barclaii cap.
3. p. 852, &c.
Kings 11.
b. p. 859.
Kings. 9.

The Preface.

...
XIII

the men now alive of this Order, never so much burden
their faces for the gainsaying of this Opinion; yet (amongst
many other) of this execrable Parricide of His Majesties
Grandfather of blessed memory, and if the supplication of
that University cannot, surely the jagat confession of their
own Authors will be (what the Pyramid was once design'd
for) a lasting and undeniable monument of their guilt.

To be plain, what has been observ'd of the Papists, that
when oppos'd they fly out into all the Pageantry of Wor-
ship; but in times of War, when they are hard press'd with
Arguments, they close intrench'd behind the Council of Trent,
is equally applicable to the Doctrines of the Jesuits; which,
when occasion serves, are openly and shamelessly profess'd;
but when the Scene is chang'd, and there is any considerable
prospect of danger, they are so modest as to palliate and
disguise them; yea, down-right (as Father Cotton did
before the Parliament) deny them. And yet all this their
master-piece nor to publish them as their first entrance into
a Kingdom, for that would spoil the Missionary Trade, and
put them under an impossibility of making Converts; but,
well knowing that time and custom do make the strangest
things familiar, they open them by degrees, and, as they
get footing therein, do more easily introduce and establish
them.

Epistle be-
fore the Me-
dall.

If it be true, as some would have us believe, that it is
an Article of the Catholick Faith, That such Doctrines are
damnable and heretical, as justify or assert the Disposing
Power; and if it be likewise true what they further believe,
that whosoever disbelieves one Article of the Catholick
Faith, disbelieves all: then, we should spare for the present
most of those Popes from Gregory the 7th, to the present
Hollis's Innocent the 11th, who hath both claim'd and
exercis'd this exorbitant Power; and in the year 1679,
thought not fit to condemn it with the rest of the Errors of
that

R. Cath. prin.
Sect. 2. 8.
Pap. Misre-
pres. p. 97.

Let. to the
Bp. of Linc.
P. 167.

that Society; and that we should say nothing of the Canonists and Courtiers of Rome, of both which the Author of the *Controversial Letters* bitterly complains; yea, that we should pass by those many Cardinals, Archbishops, Bishops, and numerous Clergy both Secular and Regular, against which Father Walsh has engaged himself in defence of Loyalty; yet we cannot but (with this our Author) be very suspicious of this Society of the Jesuits; and as to this particular question, especially since they have of late boasted of their Loyalty, desire to know of what Communion that numerous Body of men are (for they call themselves Catholics) that maintain this Doctrine in the Church of Rome: such as were Bozius, Scioppius, Alvarus, Pelagius, Becanus, Valentia, Bannes, Tanner, Em. Sa, Card. Tolet, Lessius, Delrio, Sebast. Heissius, Richeome, Seravius, Ledesmus, Mendoza, Arriaga, Suarez, Salmeron, Scribanus, Symanca, Bruns, Paul. Windeck, Rabedaneira, Baunoy, Gretser, Verone, Boucher, Turrianus, Azorius, Campanella, Forenus, Keller, Filiucius, Mariana, Santarellus, Trestam, Parsons, Campian, Creswell, Sanders, Harding, Hart, Ford, Britton, Allen, Fisher, &c. some of which agree in one, and some in all these following Propositions: 1. That the Pope may Excommunicate and Depose Kings. 2. That he can absolve Subjects from their Allegiance; or 3. That Subjects of themselves may Depose their Princes; or, 4. That they may be slain, and put to death by them. But above all, we must not omit Bellarmine, for gratitude sake, that great Champion of their Church, to whom all his successors have been so much oblig'd; he quater, in his discourse against Barclay, about Seventy of their own Authors for most of these Tenets, and condemns those ignorant that have opposed them; he says boldly, 'twas the general received opinion of the Jesuits; and labours hard with many Arguments for its defence from Councils, Fathers, Scripture and Reason; from the per-

fection.

The Preface.

XV

section both of Commonwealths, and of Christianity it self, as may be pursued at leisure, in his Books De summo Pontifice, in Respons. pro Apolog. juram. fid. in Tract. de exemptione Clericorum, &c. I shall only trouble the Reader with a sample of this celebrated Author in two or three famous passages of his; 1. He saith, 'Tis plainly repugnant to the Gospel, Matt. 17. 25. to affirm that Christ did not free Peter and Paul from subiection to temporal Princes; they were indeed afterward brought under their Government de facto, but not de jure, and were not obliged to obey them, but only for their own convenience, and the avoiding of scandal.

De excus.
Barclaii c. 3.
p. 835.

Ib. cap. 21.
p. 931.

2dly, He gives us a Reason why the Primitive Christians did not Depose Nero, Dioclesian, Julian, and Valens, and others for the space of some Hundreds of years; 'twas Quia deerant vires temporales Christianis, because they wanted temporal power and strength; for they had otherwise right given them to do it, from 1 Cor. 6. 3. Whereby they were allow'd to constitute Judges for themselves, and by the same parity of Reason he thinks, Princes also: He complains that they had no remedy at that time besides Prayers and Tears, for they were unarm'd; weak, and not able to resist their Emperors; and moreover, had no body to form them into Legions, and to lead them forth against them, and therefore were forc'd to be subject whether they would or not. In like manner,

Ib. p. 877.

3dly, He alludes to the words of St. Peter and St. Paul, 1 Pet. 2. 13. Submit your selves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake. And Rom. 13. 1. Let every soul be subject to the higher powers. His Notes upon these Texts are, Eo tempore valde necessarium erat diligenter monere Christianos, ut Regibus obedirent, ne fidei prædicatio impediretur, 'Twas necessary they should at first admonish the Christians to obey their temporal Princes, lest

De exempt.
Clericorum,
c. 3. 2d. 1599.

lest the Preaching of the Gospel should be hindered; but now these Texts concern them not, unless it can be proved that the Sheep are above their Pastor, Children above their Parents, or Temporal above Spiritual concerns: And be that pleases to look into 18, and 20 Chapters of his Excus. Barclaii, will find many more of such comments and inferences, as deserve to be answer'd rather with Whips or Flatters, than Reason or Argument.

I shall not detain the Reader any longer, but suspend what is further design'd on this subject, till the parties accus'd shall think themselves concern'd to vindicate their Loyalty against the accusation of this Author; to which I refer him, desiring only, that he would take the Epistle to the Queen Regent in his way.

TO THE
Queen Regent.

May it please your Majesty:

IN as much as it is the common opinion, as well of your own Subjects at home, as of Strangers abroad, That the Jesuits were the workers of that damnable Parricide, which striking to the heart of our deceased King (whom God absolve) hath stricken to the very Throat of France it self: and thereupon the Jesuits complain that they are wrongfully dealt withall, and that these Reports are spread by their Enemies, thereby to make them odious to the World: I thought it necessary to make appear to your Majesty, the original causes of this Aspersion cast upon them, to the end, that if it be found to spring from sure and undoubted grounds, your Majesty may from thence conjecture, whether it may stand with the safety of the present King, your Son's Life, to suffer these holy Fathers to approach near his Person: as also, whether it may be done without holding your Subjects in continual alarms, and defiances one of another. For if it were forbidden by Moses's Law (as Father Cotton hath observed, in his Epistle Dedictory) to seeth the Kid in the Milk of the Damm; much more unlawful must it needs be, to deliver the Son into hands already imbrewed in the blood of the Father. I desire not to be believed without evident Proofs, and profess

B

withall,

To the Queen Regent.

withall, that I am no way transported with passion against their Persons, nor would at all be drawn to speak or write against them, if after the manner of other Monks and Fryers, they would be content to bound themselves within the lists of instructing the People, and managing the Affairs of the Church: but that which I now speak, is not the suggestion of Hereticks, but the testimony of your highest Courts of Justice, the consent of the greatest part of your Clergy, and among them, even of the Sacred Faculty of Divinity, and in a word, the common universal out-cry of all your People: all which, notwithstanding, would willingly have learned the Art of forgetfulness with Father Aubigny, and been content to mourn without speaking a word, were it not that we see the murdering of Princes become a custom; and that if your Majesty put not to your hand to stop it sometimes, Treason will shortly stand in the rank of Christian Vertues, and be held the fairest and shortest way to Heaven.

If then your Majesty please for a while to lay aside your important Affairs of State, and to peruse this ensuing Discourse, you shall find, I doubt not, in this case, the voice of the People, the voice of God: whom I beseech to make the Flower de Luce to flourish upon your Son's head, and to pour down upon your Majesty all possible happiness.

Your Majesty's

most humble and

obedient Subject,

P. D. C.

A

REFUTATION OF Father COTTON's Declaratory Letter TO THE Queen Regent.

CHAP. I.

*That the Doctrine of the Jesuits approves and maintains
the Parricide of Kings, and the Rebellion of Subjects.*

THAT we may take all rubs out of the way,
and fully clear the doubt in question, it will
not prove unnecessary to search out, and dis-
cover the dependences of the matter in hand,
till we arise to the head-spring it self.

We find it registred in the *French History*, that in
the Year 1407. *Lewes Duke of Orleans*, Brother to King
Charles, the sixth of that name, the 22d of *November*,
in the twilight, was slain by Assassins, hired to that
purpose

A Refutation of Cotton's Letter

purpose by *John Duke of Burgundy*, who then contested his right to the Regency, against the said Duke of *Orleans* : but the Duke of *Burgundy* being no way able to invent any colourable varnish for the shifting off the Fact, grew bold to maintain in the presence of the Princes of the Blood, and Officers of the Crown, That what was acted by his command, was honourable and just ; and thereupon set a work *John Petit*, Doctor of Divinity, by birth a *Norman*, who publickly defended, That both by the Law of God and Man, as well Canon as Civil, it was lawful for any man to make away a Tyrant, and that by any means : whereupon the matter was so carried, partly through fear of violence, and partly by strength of perswasion, that the course of Justice for that time was stopt, and nothing done.

At that time there lived in *Paris*, *John Gerson*, Chancellour of the University, a man of no mean learning, (as that Age afforded) who strongly opposed himself to the fore-mentioned Proposition of *John Petit* ; inso-much, that not long after a General Council being held at *Constance*, *Gerson* was imployed thither as Ambassador from *Charles the Sixth*, having in his Instructions expresse charge to propose that Conclusion to the Fathers of the Council, by them to be further discuss'd and censured : where both Parties being indifferently heard what could be objected on either side, the Council in their fifteenth Session, condemned the Opinion of *John Petit* as heretical ; the Canon begins thus : *Quitibet Tyrannus, &c.* plainly defining, that it no way rightfully falls within the compass of the Subject's reach, to set upon the Person of his Sovereign, under pretence of curbing a Tyrant.

This Erroneous Doctrine having been now a long time quenched, as it were, and buried by the Authority of

of this Council, is now again enlightened and set a foot by the Jesuits, but under the cloak and colour of Religion; that is to say, when it shall be judged necessary to make away a King for the good of the Church: to this purpose they have published divers Discourses, in which they permit and incite the Subject to kill his Sovereign, when his Regal power degenerates into Tyranny.

Peter Ribadenera, a Spanish Jesuit, venteth this Doctrine, in a Book which he hath written of Religion, and the vertues of a Prince, speaking thus of the Parricide of James Clement: *For as much as the resolution which Henry the Third took upon him, was the advice of a Politician, and a Machiavelist, not conformable to the Rules of our Saviour; behold the reason; that by the just judgment of God, the said Henry was made away by the hand of a simple young Monk, and dyed by the stroke of a Knife.*

Carolus Scribanus, a Flemish Jesuit, who by an anagrammatistical inversion of Letters, calls himself, *Clarus Bonarscius*, hath written a Book, which he entitles, *Amphitheatrum honoris*: in which he stoutly maintains the same murdering Position. *Lib. 1. Cap. 12.* where he thus speaks: * *If it so fall out that a Denis, or a Machanidas, or an Aristotimus, monsters of their Ages, oppress France, shall not the Pope have power confidently to encourage against them some Dion, or Timoleon, or Philopæmen; that is to say, Tamers, and Quellers of Tyrants? and a little after, speaking of a Tyrant wasting France, † What? will no man take Arms against that Beast? will no Pope set free that noble Kingdom from the stroke of the Axe? where observe, that he speaks not in that Passage of an Usurper, but of a lawful King, who unlawfully useth his Power.*

Bellarmin in his second Book against the King of England, condemneth Treason and Conspiracy against Princes,

* *Dionysius, Machanidas, Aristotimus: seculorum portenta, Galliam oppriment, nemo Pontifex Dionem, Timoleonem, Philopæmen, Helenasum securus animabit?*
† *Nullus in hanc belluam miles erit? nullus Pontifex nobilissimum Regnum securi eximat?*

Princes, but in such captious and ambiguous terms, that upon the matter he seems to approve it, and incite men unto it, by commending the Jesuit *Garnet*, that being acquainted with the Conspiracy against the King of *England* by the Confessions of the Traytors, he would not disclose it : his words are these ; *Wherefore was Henry*

Cor denique *Henricus Garnet*, vir doctrina omnis generis, & vitæ sanctitate incomparabilis, ultimo supplicio affectus est, nisi quia revelare noluit, quod salva conscientia revelare non potuit ?

Garnet, a man unmatched in all kinds of learning and holiness of life, so punished in the highest degree, but only because he would not detect that, which with a safe Conscience he could not ? See then here the Doctrine of the Jesuits, which is this :

That if a man disclose unto them his purpose to kill the King, he ought to conceal it, and rather suffer the King to be killed, and the Kingdom to be ruined, than to break up the Seal of Confession : an Opinion which the *Sorbon* holds not, it being of the Law of God to be loyal to our Sovereign, and of the Law of Nations to hold the Receiver of stoln Goods as guilty as the Thief ; and in the case of Treason equally to punish the Undertaker and the Concealer, as being both principal ; an Offence of that nature admitting no accessory.

L. 13. ff. de off. præf. L. 1. ff. de Receptat.
L. Quisquis. SS. id quod Cod. ad Leg. Jul. Majest.

The same Jesuit *Bellarmin*, and together with him, the whole troop of that Society, generally defend, that the Pope hath power to dispose of Kingdoms, to bestow them as he shall see fit, on whom it shall please him, and to stir up the Subjects to rebel against their Prince, by unloosing them from their sacred bond of Allegiance : his words are these, in his Sixth Chapter and Fifth Book,

Papa potest mutare Regna, & uni auferre atque alteri conferre, tanquam summus Princeps spiritualis.

De Pontifice Romano : The Pope may dispose of Kingdoms, taking them from one, and giving them to another, as being the Supreme Prince Ecclesiastical : and the

Jesuit *Gretzer* in his Book entituled, *Vespertilio hæretico-politicus*,

politicus, pag. 159. *We are not such Dastards, that we fear openly to affirm, That the Pope of Rome may, if necessity so require, free his Catholick Subjects from their Oath of Fidelity, if their Sovereign handle them tyrannically:* Nay, the same man adds in the same place, *That if the Pope do it discreetly and warily, it is a meritorious work.* Consider here this new and unknown kind of Merit, by raising Sedition, and commanding Disloyalty, from whence must necessarily issue, attempting upon the person of the Prince: for in such a Rebellion it is to be presumed that the Prince will take Arms to safeguard himself, and oppose Force to Force, which cannot possibly be done, without manifest hazard of his life.

Tolet in his First Book of the Instructions of Priests, and 13th Chapter, affirms, *That Subjects are not bound to keep unviolate their Oath of Allegiance to an Excommunicate Person:* and again, *An Excommunicate Person cannot exercise the act of Jurisdiction:* which Rule if we admit as true, we must consequently hold that Henry the Third was no King; and he which killed him, killed no King.

Mariana, another Spanish Jesuit, hath set forth a Book, *De Rege, & Regis institutione*, first printed at Toledo, by Peter Raderigo, in the Year 1599. and since again at Mentz, by Barthasar Lippius, in the Year 1605. in the sixth Chapter of this Book, after having commended James Clement, he adds, *That he had been instructed by Divines, with whom he consulted in that point, that it was lawful to kill a Tyrant:* and thereupon describing how the young Fryer gave the deadly blow, he cries out; *Insignem animi confidentiam, facinus memorabile!* O excellent confidence of Spirit! O memorable Fact! And a little after, speaking of the same Murderer,

Tam timidi & trepidi non sumus, ut afferere palam vereamur Romanum Pontificem posse, si necessitas exigat, subditos Catholicos solvere juramento fidelitatis, si Princeps Tyrannice illos tractet, &c.

Excommunicato subditi non tenentur juramento fidelitatis. Excommunicatus non potest jurisdictionis actum exercere.

Cognito à Theologia, quod erat sciscitandum, Tyrannum jure interim posse

Suo sanguine Patriæ communis & gentis libertatem redemptam inter ictus & vulnera impense lætabatur, scilicet cæso Rege ingens sibi nomen fecit, cæde cædes est expiata ac manibus Guisii Ducis perfide perempti regio sanguine est parentatum.

therer, amidst the blows, and the wounds which he received, he continued full of comfort, as having redeemed with his Blood, the Liberty of his Country; and having slain the King, he purchased himself great renown, in expiating the death of the Duke of Guise, (treacherously made away) by shedding the Blood Royal; Thus dyed Clement, being about twenty four years of age, a young man, of nature gentle, not tough of body, but that a higher Power actuated his vigor and courage.

Thus speaks this Jesuit; and in the same Chapter, speaking of a lawful King, to whom the Subjects have passed their Oath of Allegiance, he says: *If he pervert the Religion of the Land, or if he draw the common Enemy into his Country; he that labouring to satisfy the publick desire, shall assay to kill him, shall in my judgment, not do unjustly.*

In the Chapter following, he steps yet one degree farther; in which he allows the poysoning of a Tyrant as just and lawful: notwithstanding it is worth the while to mark the niceness of the man, and how precisely those of his hair observe their Cases of Conscience; for fearing lest by poysoning the Tyrant's Meat or Drink, he should by that means be enforced to make himself away, Mariana brings this remedy:

Hoc tamen temperamento uti in hac quidem disputatione licebit, si non ipse qui perimitur venenum haurire cogitur, quo intimis medullis conceptio pereat, sed exterius ab alio adhibeatur, nihil adjuvante eo qui perimendus est, nimirum cum tanta vis est veneni ut sella eo aut veste delibuta vim interficiendi habeat.

For mine own part (saith he) I would use this moderation, not to constrain him (whom I purpose to do away) to take the poyson himself, which might presently disperse it self through his inwards, and so kill him; but that some other lay the poyson so, that he who is to dye, no way concur in the taking of it; which may be done, when the Poyson is

so strong, that a Chair, or a Garment being anointed with it, may work upon the Body which sits on the one, or wears the other : which is a cunning, I find the Kings of the Moors have often used : such is the Piety of the Jesuit, who makes us Disciples to the Moors.

This Book of *Mariana's* is commended by *Gretzer* the Jesuit, in his *Vespertilio*, alledged once already, where he affirms, *Pag.* 160. that *Mariana* is traduced, as having written that it was lawful to kill any Prince who disobeys the Pope : since he maintains, that a lawful Prince, who disobeys the Pope, notwithstanding ought not to be made away by any private man, if sentence be not pronounced against him, or that it be not demanded by the voice of the People, or that the consent of learned Men run not that way. But note this by the way, That by the definitive Sentence, he understands the Judgment of the Pope : and by the approbation of learned Men, the advice of Jesuits : and touching poyson laid upon a Garment or Chair, the Jesuit *Gretzer*, *Pag.* 162. approves simply *Mariana's* Position, and complains that *Mariana* is unjustly accused for having affirmed, that a Tyrant ought to be poisoned, seeing he maintains the contrary ; affirming, That a Tyrant cannot lawfully be made away by poyson, if himself take it, and apply it to himself, which cannot be avoided when his Meat or Drink is poysoned ; so that labouring to blanch *Mariana's* Opinion, in the end he falls upon the same himself.

Clarus Bonarscius in his 13th Chapter of his *Amphitheater*, likewise commends this *Mariana*, both for the stile and the matter, and wisheth that all Ages should reverence him : what ? (saith he) what Age shall not reverence those grave and learned Writings of *Mariana*, his piercing

Ne Tyrannum quidem primi vel secundi generis etiam post judicariam contra illum latam sententiam veneno licite tolli, si Tyrannus ipsemet venenum illud sumere & sibi applicare debeat.

Quid? *Mariana* gravem & decoram constructionem sonantis verba, splendorem narrandique Phrase,

sublimitatem copiosum ingenium in non impari materia quæ ætas non reverebitur ?

Hos Libros
approbatos
prius a viris
doctis & gra-
vibus ex eo-
dem nostro
Ordine.

Phrase, the neatness and loftiness of his Narrations, the plentifulness of his wit, together with matter commendable alike ?

And to the end that it may be known, that this Position of *Mariana* is not the Opinion of a few Jesuits ; on the fore-head of the Book you shall find an Approbation and Permission from their General *Aquaviva*, and *Stephanus Hoyeda*, Visitor of their Society in the Province of *Toledo*, for the printing of it ; in which Grant, these words may farther be observed : *These Books of Mariana have been approved by grave and learned Men of the Order of Jesuits.* Whence it appears, that howbeit the General of their Order were overtaken (as Father *Cotton* would make us believe) (forging Letters as from the said *Aquaviva*, out of his own brain) yet so it is, that their Visitor and Doctors, who had the examining and censuring of the whole Work, before it went to the Press, could not possibly be over-seen. What should we press this Point any farther ? some four Months before that execrable Parricide committed upon the person of the good King deceased, the very same Confistorical Act, by which the Arrest against *John Chastel*, and Monsieur *Thuanus* his History, were censured at *Rome*, suspended also another Book of *Mariana's*, which treats of Coins, not meddling at all with this Book which approves the murdering of Kings ; which makes me think, that his Holiness being busied about other affairs, was circumvented by the cunning of the Jesuits (who domineer at *Rome*) for otherwise he would surely, as I think, rather have censured this Book, which plainly teacheth Murder and Parricide.

This Book of *Mariana*, being first printed at *Toledo*, was brought into *France*, about eight years since, and shewed (the most Seditious Passages being marked out)

to his Majesty, who calling Father *Cotton* to him, asked him if he approved that Doctrine or no? the Jesuit, who bends with all occasions, and knows well enough how to fashion himself to the Times, replied, that he approved it not; whereupon his Majesty, by the advice of Monsieur *Servin*, his Advocate General, urged *Cotton* to write against it; but he found means to excuse himself, and avoid the task, as well perceiving that he could not oppose himself against it, but withal he must of necessity oppugn the General of their Order, the Provincial of *Toledo*, and a many of their Society, who had their fingers in approving of it; but now when he sees that through the death of the King, the Jesuits are grown into a general distast, and perceives himself to be pinched by the Court of Parliament, and the *Sorbon*, he hath published an Epistle Dedicatory, in which he would seem forsooth to condemn *Mariana*, which he performs indeed, but in such mincing gentle terms, that a man may without spectacles perceive, he fears to launce too deep, only affirming, *That it was the lightness of a soaring Quill*, instead of accusing the Person of Heresie and Perfidious barbarous Treason, and the Doctrine of Impiety, and enmity against God and Man: but howbeit he had reached home in reproving *Mariana*, yet now (as the Abbot of *Boys* hath well observed) the Medicine comes after the Patient is deceased: for had he done as he ought, he should then have put Pen to Paper when the King pressed him to it, and not suffered such an Opinion to root it self in the minds of the People, which for want of weeding out at the first, at length growing up, cost the King his life within a few years after: but let us pass to some other Examples.

There are yet at this day left alive in *Paris* above two thousand Witnesses, who upon their Credit will testify,

A Refutation of Cotton's Letter

Propter hæc
& similia manifesta
impœnitentiae signa
decrevimus
pro ipso non
esse celebra-
das exequias.

that *James Clement* ordinarily frequented the Jesuits, and that some of them accompanied him even to the Town Ditch; when he departed out of *Paris* to strike the blow; and some three months after, was published at *Paris* a Speech of Pope *Sixtus*, made in full Consistory, the 11th of *September*, 1589. in which the assassination of *James Clement* is parallell'd with the Mysteries of the Incarnation, and Resurrection, and the Exploits of *Eleazer* and *Judith*: and after having set on the Tenter-hooks the Vices of the slain King, he adds; *For these and the like manifest tokens of impenitency, we decree, that his Exequies shall not be solemnized*: Concluding with a Prayer to God, *That it would please him graciously to accomplish that which mercifully he had begun*: This Speech was imprinted at *Paris* by *Nicholas Nevil*, and *Rollin Thierry*, Printer to the Holy Union, together with the Approbation of three Doctors, *Boucher*, *Decreil*, *Ancelin*: not that I can believe, that such impious Speeches could drop from the Lips of our holy Father, but rather take it to be a meer imposture: the Jesuits and other Doctors of the same feather, having forged it, thereby to make the Murther allowable, and to incite some other to the dispatching of the succeeding King.

At the same time *John Guignard*, a Jesuited Priest, residing in *Paris*, at the College of *Cleremont*, wrote a Treatise in the praise of *James Clement*, together with divers motives for the making away the succeeding King, who last dyed; which since too manifestly appeared at the Arraignment of the said *Guignard*: for behold how God wrought, as the Commissioners were busied at the Arraignment of *John Castel*, some of them, deputed to that purpose, withdrawing themselves to the College of *Cleremont*, seized upon many Papers, among which was found a Book written by the hand of the said *Guignard*, containing

taining many Arguments and Reasons to prove that the Murther of the King was just and lawful, together with divers Inductions, and Incitements for the making away of his Successor : some of which I will here set down, being copied out of the Original, which is yet to be seen among the Records of the Court : First, *That the cruel Nero was slain by Clement, and the counterfeit Monk dispatched by the hand of a true Monk.* Secondly, *That the heroical Act of James Clement, termed by Divines a gift of the Holy Ghost, was justly commended by Burgoin, Prior of the Jacobins, Confessor and Martyr, and that by many reasons, as well at Paris, when he read there upon Judith, as also before the worthy Parliament of Tours.* Thirdly, *That the Biarnois, howbeit converted to the Catholick Faith, should be handled more gently than he deserved, if he had set on his Head a Monastical Crown : That if he could not be deposed without war, that it should be undertaken against him; and if that might not be, he must be made away privately.*

The Court having perused these Papers, and Guignard being put to his answer, freely confessed that they were written by his own hands : whereupon the Court by an arrest executed the 7th of *January, 1595.* declared the said Guignard attainted and convicted of High Treason, condemned him to make honourable amends, naked to his Shirt, the Halter about his neck, before the chief Door of our Lady's Church in *Paris*, and after this to be hung in the Greve, and his Body burnt.

May it please the Reader to make inquiry, if ever as yet any Jesuit were heard of, who condemned this Guignard of Treason and Disloyalty : but on the other side, *Richeome* in his Apology excuseth him as far as he dare, affirming that Guignard discussed the fore-mentioned Propositions only by way, and in form of Scholastical Dispute,

Dispute: and in this we agree; for I have always held it, that to kill a King is the undoubted conclusion of the Jesuits Divinity: which Position, if any Jesuit, either driven to it by force of argument, or drawn to it by shame, any-where condemn, it ariseth either from want of discretion, or learning, or some such ground.

The which may from thence be made to appear, in that the Jesuits have ranged *Guignard* in the Catalogue of their Martyrs, which they have caused to be printed at *Rome* in two forms, in the one of which *Guignard* is, in the other he is left out, to the end that some Copies at least might be passable in *France* without danger: besides this, the Jesuit *Bonarscius*, Chap. 8. of his *Amphitheater*, extols this *Guignard* to the skies; howbeit without naming him, for fear be-like of offending the King, yet openly enough to decipher him: the words are these;

Tacebo ego te clarum Cœlo
terraque fidus & ultimum nil
amplius dolituræ domus innocu-
um piammentum? Nullus tui san-
guinis vestigia dies exeret, tota-
que in hæc vota mea ibit Gallia.

*Shall I pass thee over in silence, O bright
Star, clearly shining both in Heaven and
on Earth, the last expiation of an House,
no more capable of sorrow? no day will ever
be able to blot out the tincture of thy blood:*

and then presently adds; *All France will
concur with me in these my vows*: which words are not
applicable to any but *Guignard*, who was a *French* Jesuit,
and the last that suffered in *France*.

Out of the same forge was shaped that detestable
Book, *De justa abdicatione Henrici III.* of the just degrada-
tion of *Henry* the Third. A Book whereof the Au-
thor is not certainly known, but only that it was prin-
ted at *Lions*, and bears in its forefront, the stamp of the
Jesuits.

Franciscus Verona Constantinus hath written an Apolo-
gy for *John Chastel*, which out-strips *Mariana* in villa-
ny: for in his 2d Chapter, and 2d Part, he plainly af-
firms,

firms, *That notwithstanding the decree of the Council of Constance, it is lawful for any private man to murder Kings and Princes condemned of Heresie and Tyranny.*

Now we see by the example of our two last Kings, that at their pleasure they would make Princes believe (whom they purpose to make away) that they are Hereticks, or favourers of them, if they set not their Kingdoms in combustion by Civil Wars, thereby to give advantage to the invasion of the Spaniard, or send aid to their neighbour Princes, for fear of being undermined by the House of Austria. Thus dealt the Cyclope in *Homer*, who finding no reason to misuse *Ulysses* and his Associates, and yet desirous to feed upon them, would needs persuade them that they were Pyrates. In the same Apology, he commends the Fact of *James Clement*, as being against a publick Enemy juridically condemned. The same Author in his third Chapter defends also the Fact of *John Chastel* in this manner; *That in striking at Henry of Bourbon, his intention was not to kill the King, howbeit he called himself King, since he had nothing left but the appearance of a King, as being of the Blood Royal: adding thereunto, that Henry of Bourbon could not be called King, no not since his Reconcilement to the Catholick Church.*

Emanuel Sa in his Aphorisms of Confessions, at the word *Clericus*, affirms, that the rebellion of a Clerk against the King is no Treason; in as much as he is not subject to him. *Bellarmin* in his 28th Chapter, *De Clericis*, speaks in a manner the same; *The Pope of Rome hath exempted Clerks from subjection to Princes; Kings are now*

Non obstante decreto supradicti Concilii *Constantiensis* Privatis & singulis licitum sit Reges & principes hæreticos & Tyrannidis condemnatos occidere.

Contra hostem publicum & iudice condemnatum.

Vulnerando *Henricum Bourbonium*, non voluerit lædere aut occidere Regem, etiamsi se talem dicebar, & in quo præter imaginem nihil Regii quam quod genere Regio ortus erat.

Clerici rebellio in Regem non est crimen læsæ Majestatis, quia non est subditus regi.

Summus Pontifex eximit Clericos à subjectione Principum. Non sunt amplius Reges, Clericorum superiores.

A Refutation of Cotton's Letter

no more Superiors of Clerks. Consider here a little their cunning; if you demand, whether it be lawful for a Subject to kill his King, or to rebel against him under pretence of being a Tyrant; upon this demand, the Jesuits fearing to speak too roughly, and thereby become odious, in affirming that a Clerk may kill the King; they affirm that Clerks are not subject to Princes, and from thence draw this Conclusion; that being so, they cannot be held guilty of Treason, since that he against whom they conspire, is not their Master or Lord.

Garnet the Jesuit, with *Hall* his Companion, otherwise known by the name of *Oldcorne*, were executed in *England* for tampering in the Powder-Treason: *Garnet* being apprehended upon the Deposition of one of the Conspirators, constantly, and with Oaths affirmed that he knew nothing of the Plot; whereupon the Commissioners perceiving that they gained nothing by threats, bethought themselves of another course, which was this: they lodged *Hall* in a Chamber next adjoining to *Garnet*, and wished the Jaylor to tender to *Garnet* all courteous offices, and withal to give him notice that his Companion *Hall* was placed in the next room, and that there was a little hole in the middle Wall, by means of which they might, if they thought good, interchange conference, which they daily did: in the mean time the Jaylor sets some in a close corner not far off, to listen what their talk was, who over-hearing them, by that means brought their Secrets to light, which they discovered in this Conference between themselves, but had before denied to the Judges: hereupon *Garnet* being again convicted before the Court, and finding himself discovered, confessed indeed that he understood of the Enterprize, but it was opened to him in Confession, which he could by no means unseal; there were also produced Witnesses, who
deposed,

deposed, that in a Sermon which he made to the Catholicks, he exhorted them to pray God, That an important and dangerous Business, which was then in hand, might have an happy success for the Catholick Church.

Being then demanded, Wherefore he had so constantly forsworn that which now proved to be true? He made answer, that being demanded, if he were acquainted with the Plot, he told them indeed that he knew nothing of it, but that he understood in his mind this restriction, *I knew it not to tell you*; and thereupon was brought to confess, that he had published a Book of Equivocations, prescribing therein the means to cozen the Judges by doubtful Answers, and by Ambiguities to avoid the intent of their Interrogatories.

In-behalf of this venerable Father Garnet, a Jesuit named *John l'Heureux*, but disguising his name in an Hyrogliphical form, calls himself *Andreas Eudæmon-Johannes Cydonius*, hath very lately written an Apology, Printed at Colen, by *John Kinke*, Anno 1610. together with the Approbation of the General of their Order, *Aquaviva*, and three other of their Doctors, where he maintains it tooth and nail, That it is lawful to deceive the Judges by Equivocations; and also that a Priest, for any cause whatsoever, though the life of the King, and the safety of the State stand to the stake for it, ought not to reveal any Confession. Upon the first Point, behold his words, pag. 38. *When any man is drawn into question under an unjust Tryal, no man standing bound to inform against himself (as the Law of Nature teacheth us plainly) he may peremptorily and freely deny that for which he is called into question, without any tergiversation, because he always understands this Clause, ut teneat dicere.* Here note

Cum quis nullis iustis iudiciis in ius vocatur, quia nemo tenetur seipsum magistratui prodere idque lex naturæ satis docet aperte & libere, sine ulla tergiversatione negare potest id cuius gratia accersitur quia semper clausula illa intelligitur, ut teneat dicere.

by the way, that he styles the Justice of the Kings of *England*, exercised upon the Jesuits, an unjust Jurisdiction, as if they stood not obliged to appear at their command.

Martinus Navarus Aspilcueta, a Spaniard by birth, and trained up in the same School, hath written a Book purposely of Equivocations: in which, pag. 352. he delivers this Doctrine: *That it is lawful for*

In decr. C. humane aures. 22.
quest. 3. pag. 548.

Franciscus interrogatus à li-
ctoribus homicidam persequen-
tibus, an illac ubi *S. Franciscus*
erat talis homicida transisset?
immissis manibus intra manicas,
respondit hac non transivisse, sub-
intelligendo tacite contra com-
munem intelligentiam non transi-
visse per illas manicas.

a man to dissemble his being a Catholick; and in another place allows the Answer of him as good, *who being demanded by the Serjeants, If a murtherer, whom they pursued, were not passed that way, thrusting his hand into his sleeve, protested that he passed not that way.* And in the end addeth, *That the Doctrine of Equivocations is founded upon the memorable Example of St. Francis*, which is without all doubt à

gross injury offered to the Vertue and Piety of that Holy Father, by fathering upon him the coyning of such kinds of abominable lying and cozening.

The fore-named *Andreas Eudemon-Jobannes Cydonius*, in his 40th Page, fortifies himself with the Authority of

Quando juridicè non procedir,
vel quia accusatus ei non est sub-
ditus simpliciter, vel in hoc cau-
sa, aut quacunque alia de causa,
tum licet mendacium sit illicitum,
non tamen est mortale; quia nec est contra debitum justitiæ, nec in judicio vero, sed in usurpato. Immo non erit etiam veniale si respondendo cautelosè,
& ut aiunt sophisticè, dicat aliquid falsum apud sensum judicis & apud suum verum.

Silvester, in the 5th Accusation, and 13th Question, where he thus writes: *When the Judg dath not proceed juridically, the Arraigned being not simply subject to him, either in this case, or for some other reason; upon such terms, howbeit Lying be unlawful, yet it is not a mortal sin, it being not against that which we owe to Justice and true Judgement, but only against that which is usurped: Nay, we hold it not a venial sin, if in answering warily, or as they term it, sophistically,*

stically, he utter somewhat which is false according to the apprehension of the Judge, but not in his own meaning; for that in this case, since he is not his Subject, he is not bound to speak the truth, according to his understanding. Here we must remember, that by Judgment, which is not rightful, but usurped upon those who are not Subjects, he means the passing of the Judgment of the Civil Magistrate upon Ecclesiastical Persons, and chiefly Jesuits, who are no way subject to Bishops.

The Jesuit *Tolet*, in his fourth Book of the Instructions of Priests, *Chap. 91.* speaks thus: *If the Offence be secret upon which thou art demanded, thou mayst then use Equivocation, answering, I know it not, with this reservation to thy self, to tell it you; or thou mayst answer, I did it not, understanding, at this present.*

Si crimen omnino occultum est de quo quis interrogatur, tum æquivocatione uti poterit, respondendo *nescio*, intelligendo tamen intræ se ut dicam tibi, vel respondendo *non feci*, intelligendo intra se nunc non feci.

The ancient *Arian* Hereticks chalked out this way long since to the Jesuits: For *Nicephorus*, in the Eighth Book of his History, *Chap. 51.* saith, That *Arrius*, having subscribed to the Confession of the *Nicene* Council, had another Confession hid in his Bosom, which himself had written, and thereupon confidently swore to the Emperour, that he did believe as he had written, understanding thereby the Writing which he had wrapt up in his Bosom. By vertue of this Doctrine, a man may deny his Religion, his Faith, his God, and all; telling the Judge, *That he believes not in Jesus Christ*, but with this mental Reservation, *to tell you*: and *St. Peter* denying Jesus Christ to the Maid, might well have shifted himself by the help of this Sophistry, saying, *I know him not*, but softly to himself, *to tell you*.

By this subtilty the Jesuits have found a trick, how to stir up Instruments to assault the sacred Persons of

A Refutation of Cotton's Letter

Princes, and withal to instruct them in the means not to disclose their Complices, perswading them that they may keep their Conscience safe, by such and such Equivocations, as to deny, that they never saw it, or heard of it; always provided, that they keep to themselves some secret limitation or condition, by which they may free themselves from the imputation of a lye, and not offend their Conscience. This is it which makes the Parricides of Kings so confidently to forswear themselves in the face of the Court, being taught by their Spiritual Guides, that in so doing, if they reserve some other meaning in their own minds, it offends not God at all.

And from hence it ensues, that a man cannot fix any certain belief upon Father Cotton's Protestation, in disavowing *Mariana*: for who knows, whether he have not some reservation locked up in his own breast? or who can tell whether in saying, *I condemn Mariana's Book*, he understands not, *for not having said enough*: or thus; *A private man cannot lawfully attempt upon the life of the Prince*, speaking thus to himself, *except the Pope give way to it, or the King be excommunicated, or be no true King; but such, or such, is no true King, because he doth this or that, &c.* But to conclude this Point; As in Contracts heretofore among the Ancient Romans, their Women were compelled to renounce the *Villeian* Decree, and the Authentick *Si qua Mulier*: In like manner, Father Cotton, if he would have us give credit to his Declaration, he ought first to have renounced his privilege of lying, and using Equivocation; and yet I fear, that in this very Abrenuntiation, he would have used some other Ambiguity and Craft.

The other Point maintained by *John P. Henreux* is, that *Henry Garnet* and his Companions, having understood of the Conspiracy against the life of the King, and his

his whole Race, ought not to reveal it, but keep it close: he delivers it in these terms, *Pag. 262.* of his

Apology: Add hereunto the scandal which Catholics would conceive, if a Priest, a Jesuit, being consulted in a Case of Conscience, and that in the most Religious Act of Confession (the most sacred Mystery among Catholics), should inform against one, who comes to crave advice: for to whom would they afterward address themselves to be resolved in their Scruples of Conscience? or whom can they trust, if they find no faithfulness in Priests? And in the 290th Page, A thing sealed up with the most holy Signet of Confession, cannot be broken up without detestible Sacrilege:

His 13th Chapter entire is spent about this subject, in which at length he comes to this pass, to affirm, *That there cannot fall out so great a mischief, for the avoiding of which, it can be lawful to disclose a Confession.* The Jesuit *Suarez* says the same in effect in his *Treatise of Penance*: * *Yea, though the safety of the whole Commonwealth should stand upon it.*

Adde Catholicorum scandalum, & offensionem si Sacerdos idemque Jesuita conscientiae causa consultus idque interposita confessionis religione qua nulla major inter Catholicos esse potest, consultores suos detulisset? quem enim in posterum in rebus suis dubiis adire, aut cui amplius fidere possint si ne in sacerdotibus quidem fidem inveniant?

Rem sacrosancto confessionis arcano obsignatam sine immanni sacrilegio prodi non potuisse.

* Disput. 33. sect. 1. num. 2.

Of late days, since the death of the last King, *Father Fronton*, Jesuit, tho' less seditious than the rest, accompanied with another Jesuit, came not long since to the King's Library at the *Cordeliers*, and there finding *Monsieur Causabon*, the Keeper of it, they fell into dispute with him upon this Theam; *Fronton* maintaining it stoutly, That he would rather all the Kings in the World should perish, than that he would reveal one Confession.

How then? Shall a Son rather suffer his Father to be slain, than acquaint him that such or such lie in ambush.

ambush to kill him, though he have received it under the Seal of Confession? or shall a Jesuit rather suffer his King and Country to swim in Blood, than open a Confession? yea, but will some man reply, the Confessor must be faithful to his Penitentiaries: it is true; but I say also, that he ought to be obedient to his God, and loyal to his Sovereign: God commanding us to be faithful to him, to whom we have solemnly sworn Allegiance: and if we look into those sacred Tomes of Holy Writ, we shall meet with store of Passages which enjoin us loyalty and obedience to Kings, but not so much as a syllable of enjoining secrecy after Confession: it is a Precept which the Church only hath put upon us, but with this caution, that it be not prejudicial to the Commandments of God, or that under the pretence of secrecy, we turn Traytors; and by our perfidious silence, become the cause of the murdering of our Father, or our King; which is, as if I espying one, who hastning to set fire on his Brother's or Neighbour's House, should quietly suffer him to do it, because I had promised to disclose it to no man. No certainly, we must believe that, on the contrary, rather the breach of such manner of Obligations is more praise-worthy in it self, and pleasing to God: for he that can prevent a mischief, and yet suffers it to pass, was ever held as guilty. And surely

*Homer. Il. a. words 103-104:
 Λύγας αἰδὲ πῆλιν· ἄρ. L. 1. Sect.
 occisorum cum seqq. ff ad S. C.
 Syllania. L. 9. Sect. 1. ff ad leg.
 Cornel. de fals. L. 1. Cod. de
 falsa mon. L. quisquis Cod. ad
 leg. Jul. Majest.*

for none other reason is it, that *Homer* in the very entrance of his *Iliads*, tells us; *that the rage of Achilles against Agamemnon, slew many valiant Men, and gave their Carcasses as Preys to the Dogs.* And hence it is, that in the *Roman Laws*, such kind of Patience is as far forth liable to punishment, as the principal Act it self: which Rule hath its place and truth, not only in common Crimes, but

but most especially in Treason, as the Lawyers teach. And to the end that no *Marianist* may object that the Founders of those Laws were Pagans, the Popes themselves have ever heretofore maintained the same to be just, in like case together with the whole rabble of Canonists, adding their reason; That there is a great presumption of secret intelligence and correspondence between the Delinquent and the Connivant.

Idem in cap.
quantæ, de
sentent. ex-
commu. cap.
delicto. de
sentent. ex-
communi. In
6 Cano. non
inferenda. 23.
quest. 3.

The Jesuit then, and Cardinal *Bellarmin*, take the wrong Pig by the ear, in labouring to justify *Garnet* and *Oldcorne*, as if they had well done, especially since they might easily have brought the matter to light without accusing any body, by writing a word or two to warn the King to look to his Person, or to search under the Parliament-House, and by that means might the Conspiracy have been discovered, and not the Confession. The source and spring of all this mischief, ariseth from that Vow which the Jesuits take, To obey their Superiours, that is to say, the Generals of their Order (who of necessity ought always to be subject to the King of *Spain*) as also to their other Governours, and that with a simple, absolute, unlimited Obedience, not so much as enquiring why or wherefore, which themselves call an obedience, not of will only, but of judgment, or a blind obedience. There is a little Pamphlet, entituled, *Regulæ Societatis Jesu*, which themselves have caused to be printed at *Lyons*, Anno 1607. by *Jaques Rouffin*, in the end of which they have set a long Epistle of *Ignatius Loyola's*, the *Spanish* Souldier, Patron and Founder of their Sect: in which the said *Ignatius*, Pag. 254. lays down these Rules to his Society: *Enter-
tain the Command of your Superior in the
same sort, as if it were the Voice of Christ:*
And a little after, *hold this undoubted,*

Statuatis vobiscum ipsi quic-
quid superior præcipit ipsius Dei
præceptum esse, arque ut id cre-
denda quæ Catholica fides pro-

That

A Refutation of Cotton's Letter

ponit toto animo affectuque vestro statum incumbitis: sic ad ea facienda quæcunque superior dixerit cæco quodam impetu voluntatis parendi cupidæ sine ulla prorsus dispositione seramini.

That all which your Superior commands, is none other than the Commandment of God himself; And as in believing those things which the Catholick Faith proposeth, you are presently carried with all the strength

of your consent: so for the performance of all those things which your Superior commands, you must be carried with a certain blind impetuosity of will, desirous to obey, without farther inquiring why or wherefore. And to the end that they might not find any escape by the word *quodam*, certain impetuosity, other Passages there are in the same Epistle, where that word is forgotten; as where he says, *perit cælebris illa obedientiæ cæcæ simplicitas.* For in as much as those things which the Superiors command, might sometimes seem unjust and absurd, this Saint (though not yet canonized) commands the Jesuits so to captivate their Understanding, that they silt not the Commands of their Superiors, after the example of *Abraham*, who prepared even to sacrifice his Son at the Commandment of God, and of Abbot *John*, who watered a dry Log of Wood a whole year together, to none other purpose but to exercise his Obedience; and another time put himself to the thrusting down of a great Rock, which many men together were not able to move; not that he held them things either useful or possible, but only that he would not disobey the Command of his Superior.

This Rule then consequently draws to this issue, That if the chief of the Jesuits Order, among whom their General is always subject to the King of *Spain*, command a young *French* Jesuit any thing whatsoever, he stands bound instantly to put it in execution, without so much as casting an eye upon the danger or difficulty of it, or any way respecting how damageable it might prove, either

then to himself, or the State. A Maxim, which if it be held as sound, our Kings shall no longer be secure of their Lives, than the Heads of the Jesuits command their Underlings nothing to the contrary: for it being once commanded, they are forbidden to enquire if the thing be just, the matter given them in charge, shall be sure to carry the name of *the good of the Church*, and be grounded upon a satisfaction for some enormous Sins, or upon the hope of being crowned Martyr, and obtaining in Heaven some preheminance above the ordinary.

This Vow is also the cause, that the Jesuits are exempt from the obedience of Bishops; for it had been a matter merely impossible to obey their Superiors in all things, if the Bishops had had power to correct or hinder that which the Superiors should command.

Some one it may be will tell me, That these things are indeed clear enough, and the Testimony sufficient to settle any man's Judgment in discerning the Doctrine of the Jesuits: but whence comes it to pass then (will some body here object) that in some places they condemn the murdering of Kings, and maintain that a Subject ought not to attempt upon the person of his Sovereign, howbeit he be viciously given, and abuse his Power? To which I answer, That the Opinion indeed of some of the Jesuits is, That a Subject ought not to rebel against his Sovereign, although he be an Heretick, or a Tyrant, before the Sentence of Deposition be pronounced by the Pope, or by some of the most Learned, among which the Jesuits ever suppose themselves to stand in the first degree; and that by expresse declaration, the Subject may be unloosed from his Oath of Allegiance, as the Jesuit *Andreas Budemans Johannes* teacheth at large, in the third Chapter of his Apology for *Henry Garnet*: but they also generally hold, That after Sentence of Deposition,

which is commonly procured at the instance of these Holy Fathers, such or such a King is no longer King, and that another ought to supply his room, and that his Subjects owe him no obedience at all. This point is at large demonstrated by the same Jesuit in the same Chapter, and we have already made it clear, that the same is also the Doctrine both of *Bellarmin* and *Gretzer*. Nay, *France* it self hath by experience sensibly felt the smart of it, to her great misery and grievance. Now this is it which I affirm, That whosoever maintains that the Pope can at his pleasure alter Kingdoms, displacing one, and setting up another, and exempt the *French* from their Oath of Allegiance, consequently maintains, That the *French*, in such a case, ought to kill their King: For a man may well think that a King, from whom offer is made to snatch away his Kingdom, will take Arms to maintain his Right, and labour to reduce his Subjects to Loyalty, who stand armed against him: Now in such a War, and among so many Rebels, it is impossible that the Prince should not run in hazard of his Life, since, that in defending himself, he is resolute not to lose his Kingdom, but with the loss of his Life: These be the Subtilties of the Jesuits, by which they enchant men; They protest solemnly that they allow not the murdering of Kings; but herein lies the craft, That they acknowledge none for Kings, but whom themselves please; and maintain, that to kill a King, whose Government they cannot brook, is not to kill a King, but a Man (as they say) masked under that title.

But yet mark here another mischief, by which they are plainly convict to be Enemies to our Kings: for the *French* could never yet be brought to acknowledge, that the Crown of *France* depended from the Holy See, or that the Pope might give it to, or take it from whom he

he thought fit, and never approved the Canon *Alius*, which is to be found, *Causa 15. Decret. quest. 6.* and runs thus in plain terms: *Zachary, the Pope of Rome, deposed the French King, not so much for his Wickedness, as for that he was incapable of a so great a Power; and hath set Pippin, Father to Charles*

Romanus Pontifex Zacharias scilicet Regem Franciscorum non tam pro sua iniquitatibus, quam pro eo quod tantæ potestati erat inutilis, à regno deposuit, &c.

the Emperor, in his room, and absolved all French-men from their Oath of Allegiance. By vertue of which Canon the Pope attributes to himself power to remove the Crown from the Heads of our Kings, without regarding whether they be Hereticks or Catholicks; whether of a vicious, or innocent and vertuous life; but only if in his Judgment he find them unfit, and some other more capable of Government. Whosoever maintains this Opinion, withal cannot but hold that our Kings are meerly titular, and that their Crown is held at the mercy and disposition of the Pope.

But the Jesuits hold, that the Pope cannot err in Doctrine, and thereupon maintain all and every Article which he teacheth; whereupon consequently it followeth, That the Pope in pronouncing this Decree, hath spoken nothing but the truth.

I will add hereunto yet one Point more touching the Doctrine of the Jesuits, which may give us a fuller taste of their humour. At *Garnet's* Arraignment, among other matters which he confessed, he acknowledged that *Catesby*, the Ring-leader in the Conspiracy, was touched with remorse of Conscience, because, that the time drawing near for the acting of the Plot, he considered, that in blowing up the Parliament-house, he must needs, together with the Hereticks, make away many Innocent Catholicks: now to be resolved of this Scruple, he addresseth himself to *Garnet*, and demands of him, whe-

A Refutation of Cotton's Letter

ther in putting to death the bad, a man might, with a safe Conscience, make away the good also that were found among them? *Garner* to this question thus replies, That he should make no doubt, but that he might justly murder both the one, and the other, provided always that it advanced the good of the Catholick Church. Is it possible to find a more desperate Rage than this, which, to kill Kings, spareth not the dearest Blood both of Brothers and Friends? And this I report, not only from the Testimony of *Garner's* Arraignment, but from the Confession of those Jesuits, who, since his death, have written Discourses in his commendation: for the Apology of *Garner*, composed by *Joh. F. Heuren*, and approved by their General *Aquaviva*, and three other of their Doctors, confirms the same, and offers to make good this Fact of *Garner*, Pag. 103. and 265. He confesseth moreover, that *Garner*, in his publick Prayers, in a Catholick Assembly, exhorted the People to pray unto God, for the good success of an Enterprize, which was to be executed at the opening of the Parliament: and Pag. 269. he confesseth, that the Jesuit *Hall* being apprehended, and put to his Answer, That we were not to judg by the unfortunate success of the Enterprize, of the justness of the Cause. And Pag. 273. he acknowledged, That the Rebels having taken up Arms after the Enterprize was discovered, the Jesuit *Hamond*, instead of perswading them to disarm themselves, and lay aside their Weapons, taken up against the King, gave them all Absolution. Again, Pag. 275. he affirmeth, That all that were of the *Powder-Treason*, were Men of very tender and scrupulous Consciences. The same Apology, Pag. 310. witnesseth, That the Jesuit *Garner*, in certain Letters of his, resolving to hazard his Life for the Catholick Cause, speaks thus; *It is necessary that*

Monet omnes
qui ad solem-
nem Ecclesie
cærum conve-
nerant, ut ob-
nixè orent
Deum pro fe-
lici successu
gravissimæ
cujusdam rei
in causa Ca-
tholicorum
sub initium
comitiorum.

one man dye for the whole People : applying to his own person those Speeches which Caiaphas, inspired by the Holy Ghost, prophesied, touching the Redemption of the World by the Death of our Saviour. At the Arraignment of the same Garnet, he confessed to the Commissioners, deputed to examine him, that he had offered Sacrifice unto God, for the hindering of the Enterprize; yet with this restriction, if it were not profitable for the Catholick Church; hereupon the Apologist labours to excuse him in these words: *Garnet approved not the Fact, but loved the Event*: as if a man should say, that he approved not the murdering of the King, and his Family, but yet was glad that it was done: These are the windings and turnings of the Jesuits, ready to say and unsay the same thing in the same line. These were the Heroical Exploits for which Garnet and Oldcorne, justly executed as Traytors, are by Bellarmine stiled by the honourable name of Martyrs, as also by the Apologist, approved, as I have said before, by the General of their Order, *Aquaviva*, and three of their Doctors, and thereupon they are ranged in the Catalogue of the Jesuits Martyrs, lately printed at Rome: a Copy of which is to be seen and sold, at the Palace in the Prisoners Gallery, and that since the death of the King. From hence then let the Kings and Princes of Christendom duly consider, in what safety they can live hereafter, since the People are instructed by these Doctors, to seek the glory of Martyrdom in the villany of Murther; and let all good Catholicks be moved with just grief, that the sacred name of Marryr, so much honoured in the Primitive Church, should now a-days be given to bloody Barbarous Parricides, and Disloyal Traytors.

Neque vero ob eam rem factum probabat sed amabat eventum.

I pass over my Judgment to what purpose that distinction tends, which the Jesuits make of two sorts of Catholicks;

tholicks; naming the one True Catholicks, and the other State Catholicks: for these latter, howbeit they accord in all Points of Faith with the *Roman Church*, yet are they not esteemed of them but as Demi-Catholicks, because, forsooth, they will not be as factious as they are, nor approve Treason and Rebellion; a distinction which, without all peradventure, will breed a Schism in the Church of God, if his Mercy prevent it not.

These Accusations which we have mustered together in this Chapter, sufficiently witness, that *Mariana* hath not alone stragled out of the way, but that all the Jesuits, upon this matter, err with him, whom Father *Cotton* cannot justify in general, without giving satisfaction to the particular Objections dawn out of other Books, as exprefs for the murdering of Kings, as that of *Mariana's*.

C H A P. II.

Wherein the same thing is further proved by the Facts of the Jesuits.

WE have already sufficiently proved by the Writings of the Jesuits, that it is an Opinion generally currant among them, That it is lawful, even for private men, to kill Kings: now we come to demonstrate the same in their Actions, the horrible effect of a detestible Doctrine.

It may from thence strongly be presumed, that this mischievous Sect first set a-foot this Doctrine, in as much as before their arising, never a word was extant of attempting upon the Persons of Kings, under pretence of Religion: and behold, since, two of our Kings successively have

have miscarried through the impressi^on of this damnable Perswasion; and if some order be not soon taken against it, it will turn into custom.

And we have found by experience in *France*, how pernicious unto a State this Sect is, which coming out of *Spain* above fifty years since, yet could not the sweetness of the *French* Air, qualify the fierceness of their Spirit unto this day. A very strange thing, considering that heretofore even Lyons and Tygers, being brought unto the Temple of *Adonis* in *Persia*, were no sooner entred there, but that their rage and natural cruelty was changed into such a gentleness, as is almost incredible.

*Acilian. de
animalib.
lib. 12. cap. 23.*

And if it pleased the Queen, and my Lords the Princes of the Blood, to inform themselves thoroughly by my Lords the Presidents, and Councillors of the Court, or by the Advocates and Attornies General of his Majesty, of the Proceedings taken against the Jesuits, they shall find this which followeth to be true, which we have drawn out of the Arrests of the said Court, and out of the Interrogatories of the Convicted, which are yet kept in the Office of the same Court, namely:

That in the Year 1594. the 27th of December, *John Chastel*, Clerk, brought up in the College of the Jesuits, having given the late King a stab with a Knife in the Mouth, thinking to have given it in the Breast, was taken, and committed to the Provost of the King's House, and brought into the Bishops Prison, where, upon examination, he confessed, That long ago he had purposed in himself to give this stab; and missing of his purpose, he would do it yet, if he could, being perswaded that it would be for the good of the Catholick, Apostolick, and Roman Religion. Being brought from thence to the Prison of the Palace, he was examined by the chief Officers of the Court, to whom he confessed, amongst other things, That whereas

A Refutation of Cotton's Letter

he had a conceit that he should be forgotten of God, and was certainly perswaded, he should be damned like Antichrist, of two evils he made choice to avoid the worst; and being a damned Person, he had rather his damnation should be in a fourth degree, than in an eighth. Being demanded where he had learned this new Divinity, he made answer, *That it was by Philosophy.* Being asked whether he had studied Divinity in the College of Jesuits, he answered, *Yea, and that under Father Gueret, with whom he had continued two years and a half.* Being (further) asked, whether he had ever been in the *Chamber of Meditations*, whither the Jesuits use to bring the greatest Sinners, there to behold the representation of many Devils, diversly and fearfully shaped (under colour of reducing them to a better life) thereby to cause a perturbation in their Spirits, and consequently upon such or such Resolutions to push them forwards to the undertaking of some great Action. His Answer was, *That he had often been in this Chamber of Meditations.* Being demanded, whether the killing of the King were not matter of ordinary discourse amongst those Jesuits, he made answer, *That he had heard them say, It was lawful to kill the King; and that he was no Member of the Church, neither ought we to obey him, nor hold him for (our) King, until he had (received) approbation from the Pope.*

During the foresaid Proceedings, certain of the Lords of the Court, came to the College of Cleremont, where the Jesuits were, and (there) seized on the Papers of *John Guignard*, amongst which there was found a Book composed in the praise of *James Clement*, who murdered *Henry the Third*, with exhortation to do the like unto his Successor: out of which Book divers *Charges* have been produced in the first Chapter.

The Court, upon the sight of these Writings, sent for *Guignard*, the Author, who, when his Writings were shewed him, and himself examined thereupon, confessed that himself had composed them, and written them with his own hand. And hereupon *Guignard*, by sentence of the Court, was (condemned and) executed the 7th of *January*, 1595.

By another Sentence was *Peter Gueret*, Jesuit, the Master of *John Chastell*, condemned to perpetual banishment, and all his Goods seized on, and confiscated unto the King, with commandment for the erection of a Pyramid before the great Gate of the Palace, with an Inscription containing the Causes why the Jesuits were banished. In which (Inscription) they are termed *Hereticks, Troublers of the State, and Corrupters of Youth*. Which Pyramid, while it stood, if any did ask why it was set up, many more now a-days are ready to ask why it was pull'd down.

A Case-like unto this fell out at *Melun*, the last of *April*, 1593. what time the Process criminal was made against *Peter Barriere*, who being apprehended upon the Intelligence of a Fryer, an honest Man, and faithful unto the King, confessed, *That he came purposely unto the Court to make away the King; and that he had been incited hereunto by one Varade by name, a Jesuit, whose daily practice was to defame the King with vile Speeches*. By the perswasion of this Jesuit, the foresaid *Barriere* had prepared a Knife to do the feat. About this he first of all asked the advice of *Aubry*, Curate of *St. Andrew des arts*, to whom he made his Purpose known, and afterwards betook himself unto *Varade*, Rector of the Colledge of Jesuits, upon the foresaid *Aubry* his advice. That the said *Varade* confirmed him in his resolution to kill the King, and that by assuring him, That in case he were

F

appre-

A Refutation of Cotton's Letter

apprehended, and put to death, he should obtain in Heaven a Crown of Martyrdom. That the said *Parade* adjured him to this Action, upon the Sacrament of Confession, and of Communion of the Body of our Lord.

It was also observed, That when the late King was stricken, their Colleges being environed with a Guard, certain Jesuits cried out at the doors of their Chambers; *Surge frater, agitur de Religione: Up Brother, up, our Religion is in danger.*

Besides this, in the College of the said Jesuits, there were found divers Themes given by the Masters of Forms, the argument of all which was an exhortation to *set upon Tyrants, and to suffer death constantly.*

It was also certified to be true, that after *Paris* was reduced under the King's obedience, the Masters of the College of Jesuits forbad their Scholars to pray for the King.

Elsewhere Informations have been made against *Alexander Hayes*, Jesuit, born in *Scotland*, who taught openly, that it was good to dissemble, and for a while to perform obedience unto the King in shew. He was wont to say, *Jesuita est omnis homo.* This Jesuit was further charged to have said, and that often, that he wished if the King came along by their College, he might fall out of the Window upon him, and break his Neck. For which cause, by the Sentence of the Court, given the 10th of *January*, 1595. the said *Hayes* was condemned to perpetual banishment; and withal, he was wished to keep himself out of the Country, upon pain of being hanged, without any other form of Arraignment. Moreover, the said Fathers have been often convicted for corrupting Children, that so they might send them into strange Countries against the will of their Fathers. As

for instance, in the Year 1595. the 10th of *April*, a Jesuit, by name *John the Fayre*, of the College of *Cleremont*, did honourable Penance in the great Chamber, during the Audience, bare-head, and bare-foot, in a white Sheet, holding in his hand a burning Torch of two pound weight of wax, and sentenced to profess and declare upon his knees, that rashly and unadvisedly he practised to seduce *Francis Veron*, Clerk, Student in the University of *Poitiers*, to send him forth of the Kingdom. And further, That he had indiscreetly reserved and kept with him Lectures and Treatises made by some of the said Society, which he received, and wrote out with his own hand in the said College of *Cleremont*, containing many damnable Instructions to attempt against Princes, and (withal) approbation and commendation of that detestable Parricide committed upon the person of our King of most blessed memory, *Henry the Third*. These are things so common, and so well known, that who so should add any thing fictitious thereunto, cannot have any hope to be believed; and he must needs be accounted impudent that should deny them, the whole body of the Court being Witnesses of the truth of them. Besides all this, There is no man that hath not by experience found, that the Jesuits were never other than sworn Enemies unto our Kings. For during these last Troubles, which endeavoured to transport *France* into *Spain*, there were many of the Religious Persons found, and that of all Orders, to have taken the King's part; but there was no one Jesuit found to be for him, until such time as for their Crimes they were driven out of the Kingdom.

In a word, The late King our Prince, who never was afraid in War, (yet) was afraid of these Men in Peace. My Lord, the Duke of *Sully* can testify this, who per-

A Refutation of Cotton's Letter

swading the King not to recall the Jesuits, was answered by him, *Give me then security for my life.*

And if we step forth of the Kingdom of *France*, we shall find many Examples of the like. In all the Conspiracies against *Elizabeth*, the late Queen of *England*, it was always found that some Jesuits or other had the tempering of them: and yet for all this they cease not to martyr her with wrongful Speeches after her death, provoked hereunto by this, that she suffered them not to murder her. Bonarscius the Jesuit, in the first Book of his *Amphitheater*, and fourth Chapter, calls her, *Lupam Anglicanam, the English Wolf*. And the Jesuit Eudæmon Jobannes, in the 116th Page of his Apology for Garnet, calls her *Sororis Filiam, Patris Nepiæm: Her Sister's Daughter, and her Father's Niece.*

Of late *Henry Garnet, Hall*, surnamed *Oldcorne, Hamond, John Gerard*, and *Grinvelle*, were found to be Complices in that Powder-Mine, which was made under the House where the King, with the States of the Country, were to assemble together. And for these, the Jesuit, *John the Happy*, had writ an Apology: wherein he confesseth, That indeed they knew of the Design, but that they ought not to reveal it. It was found also that they had communication (hereon) by Letters with *Baldwin*, the *English* Jesuit, who (then) lived at *Bruxels*: this Jesuit was taken since as he passed through the *Palsgrave* Country; and we doubt not, but that if he were but a little stretcht by the fingers, a man might learn strange Mysteries of him; yea, and that he had some intelligence (too) with *Francis Ravillac*, who had been in *Flanders* somewhat before his cursed Enterprize.

And if you pass into *Poland*, you shall find, that the Jesuits do absolutely possess the King; and having, as it were, the Tutorship of him, have carried him into such
violent

violent Courses, that the Country, by their means, is risen up against him, and he in great hazard of his Kingdom. Their Factious Humour is the cause that *Sueden* is lost from the Crown of *Poland*, and from the Catholick Church. For they have moved the King of *Poland*, to make war upon Duke *Charles* (who now styles himself King) so by force to compel him to receive the Jesuits.

Neither is *Transylvania* free. We have seen the Letters of the Baron of *Zerotin*, dated the 2d of *May* last, wherein he declareth how a Lord of the Country, having a Jesuit (with him) in his House, was by the same Jesuit drawn to conspire the death of the Prince of *Transylvania*; who being advertised of the day (appointed) for the Enterprize, went forth of the Town that day, giving out that he went to hunt, and laid an Ambush without the Town, wherein he surprized the Enterprizers, who followed after him to execute their Design upon him. He put them all to death, and the said Jesuit was executed with the general slaughter of his Complices.

The House of *Austria* alone hath this Privilege, (as) to be free from the Conspiracies of this Society. Of this Family the Princes lives are sacred and inviolable unto the Jesuits: for the Founder of their Order, and the General of their Society being a *Spaniard*, to whom they have vowed a blind obedience under Oath, it is not to be feared, in this respect, that ever they should be moved to enterprize ought against the Kings of *Spain*, or against such as are of his House.

And therefore it is not without cause, that the Commonwealth of *Venice* (whose wisdom of Government is to be admired), hath driven them out of *Venice*, and out of all their Dominions: They (well) perceive that these

Men

Men are Creatures of Blood, and Fire-brands of War, whom they can better endure without, than within their Country. For their last Troubles had their beginning from the Jesuits: for whereas the Senate had discovered, that the Jesuits by cunning Fetches had gotten great store of Legacies by Will, and made themselves Lords of much Land, to the prejudice of the Commonwealth: It was concluded by advice in Council, to prohibit all Clergy-men thence forward to receive any Goods immoveable by Testament, without leave of the Commonwealth: whereunto; when other of the Church submitted, the Jesuits, who opposed it, and wrought against it at *Rome*, were for ever banished the State.

And for these Considerations it is, that the City of *Orleans* would never receive them, albeit they have much desired it, and laboured it. They sent thither one of their Company to preach their Lent Sermons; but the Inhabitants were not very well satisfied: for instead of studying, he busied his Brains in searching out, and entertaining such as had yet in their hearts any (remainder of the) old leaven of the League: by whose entercourse this Jesuit set the report going, that the King's pleasure was, they should be established there. Heretofore their talk was of driving out the Monks of *St. Sampson*, that they might get their Church, and of displacing *Monsieur*, the Marshal of *Chastres*, Governor of that City, to get his House, making reckoning to joyn it together with the Houses in the way unto the foresaid Church. And besides all these preparatives, having given the King to understand, that the Citizens of *Orleans* did exceedingly desire their company, they did so importune his Majesty, that he granted them to have an House there, yet with this charge, that the Citizens should be drawn to consent unto it. Now when they

were

were solemnly assembled together about this matter, one amongst them, *Tourville* by name, a famous Advocate of the City, a Man of Learning and Judgment, declared unto them the Inconveniences that might befall the City if they did admit them; and by strong Reasons made it good, That in France for a man to love his King and the Jesuits, were things that could not stand together. The chief Officers of Justice following this first Motion, and all the Citizens concurring jointly in the same Opinion, it was concluded, that they should not be received. This City at other times hath drunk of the Cup of Rebellion, with many others; but since their reducing under obedience unto the King, they have at all times declared themselves most faithful; even by their carriage in this last common Affliction, as they have declared more grief than any other, so do they make the continuance of their Obedience appear by all manner of good Works, more than any other.

C H A P. III.

That the Jesuits are guilty of the Murther of our deceased King, Henry the Fourth.

WHosoever shall consider the Crime of this wicked (wretch) *Ravillac*, in every part and circumstance of it, shall easily perceive that the Jesuits were very deeply concerned in it, and that the mischief came no otherwise, than by their Instruction.

It is some five years since that at *St. Victors*, there was a Maid possessed with a Devil, whose Instrument she was for the telling of divers things that seemed admirable. *Father Cotton*, either moved with curiosity, or ground-
ing

A Refutation of Cotton's Letter

ing himself upon the familiarity he had with his Spirits, took a Journey thither, to question with this Spirit on divers Points which he had a desire to know. And to help his Memory, he wrote in a Ticket the Points wherein he was to demand: Amongst other Points, these were some: *What should be the issue of the Conversion of Monsieur de la Val: and of the Enterprizes against Geneva: and of the continuance of Herefie: and of the Estate of Mademoiselle Aca-rie; and about the Life of the King.* There were many like unto these: but so it fell out, that Father Cotton, delivering unto Monsieur Gillot, Counsellor, in the great Chamber, a Book which he had promised him there, through some oversight, left behind him his Memorial, which falling by this means into the hands of the said Mr. Gillot, he communicated it unto certain others, and amongst others, to my Lord the Duke of Sully, and so the matter came abroad. Had this fallen out at some other time, while some vigour of spirit yet remained in men, this had been sufficient to have entred an Indictment against the Jesuit; it being a matter capital for a man to enquire about the term of his Prince's life: (and that) not only by the Roman Laws, the Authors whereof were Pagans and Idolaters; but even by the Laws of God, as we may read in the 18th Chapter of *Deuteronomie*. And *Tertul-lian* gives the reason of it in his Apologetic, to wit, that such a one hath imaginations against the Prince's life, that makes such inquirings about it.

Paulus, lib. 5.
Sentent. tit. 21.
sect. 9.

Qui de salute
Principis vel
summa Rei-
pub. Mathe-
maticos, Ari-
stolos Aruspices

Vaticinatores consultit, cum eo qui responderit capite punitur. Cui autem opus est scri-
benti super *Cæsaris* salute nisi à quo adversus illam aliquid cogitatur, aut post illam supera-
tur & sustinetur?

Two years after this, so it fell, that Monsieur *de le Forze*, Lieutenant for the King in *Bearne*, by the Intelli-
gences which he had from *Spain*, by reason of his neigh-
bourhood unto it, was advertised, that a *Spaniard* of

†

such

such a stature, such an hair, and in such apparel, departed such a day from *Barcelona*, to go into *France*, with intention to make away the King, by Poyson or other means. Well, this *Spaniard* came to *Paris*, addressed himself to Father *Cotton*, who brought him unto the King, and gave high commendations of him. A-while after came the Letters of Monsieur *De la Forze*: when the King had read them, he sends (forth) to seek Father *Cotton*, and shews him the Letters of Monsieur *De la Forze*, and commands him to bring back again that same *Spaniard*. Father *Cotton* answers, he could not believe it, and that the Advertisement was false: nevertheless, he would go seek out the said *Spaniard*, and bring him before his Majesty. Whereupon he goes forth, and returning a good while after, he tells the King, he could not find him, and that he was gone. To see clearly unto the bottom of this, but a little good sight is sufficient.

It is not above a year ago that Father *Cotton* wrote unto a Provincial of *Spain* divers things which our King had uttered in secret, and revealed in Confession, and such as turned to the disgrace of his Majesty. The discovery whereof, was the cause why he continued in disgrace for the space of six Months. Nevertheless, the late King (through a clemency (that was) fatal unto his own destruction) forgave him, and received him into favour. But it may be remembred, how not many days after, our young King being importuned by him, gave him a gird, by such an answer as he well deserved, in these terms; *I will tell you nothing, for you will write it into Spain, as you have done the Confession of my Father.*

And to come near the Fact of *Ravillac*: like as after the death of *Henry the Third*, a man might hear the

A Refutation of Cotton's Letter

Jesuits preach seditiously, and exhort their Auditors to do the like unto his Successor; and among others, Father *Commolet*, crying out in his Sermons, *We have need of an Ehud, be he a Monk, or be he a Souldier, we have need of an Ehud*: Just so at Lent last, might a man have heard a Jesuit, by name Father *Hardy*, Son to one *Mercier*, dwelling on *Nostre Dame Bridge*, preaching at *St. Severins*, and saying, *That Kings heaped up Treasures to make themselves feared, but that there needed but a Mattock to kill a King*. In witness whereof, I can produce Monsieur *le Grand*, and Monsieur *de la Vau*, Councillors of the Court, who were present thereat, besides divers others.

At the same time Father *Gontier* preached so seditiously, and so injuriously against the King, that Monsieur the late Marshal of *Ornano*, as zealously affected unto the Catholick Religion, as any man in *France*, being asked of his Majesty what he thought of his Sermons; made answer to him, That if *Gontier* had spoken as much at *Burdeaux*, he would have caused him to be thrown into the River. Every one from that time might prognosticate some great mischief, and the murmur was so great amongst true *Frenchmen*, that my self falling on a time amongst good Company, where some speech past between us, one of them affirmed, That a jolly Man of quality, called Monsieur *de la Grange*, Secretary to the Prince of *Condy*, would avouch to Father *Gontier's* (face), that whilst (during these Wars) he remained Prisoner at *Perigous*, the said *Gontier*, in presence of Father *Saphore*, Rector of the College, did maintain against the said *de la Grange*, that it were a good deed to kill the King.

Yet this is not all: for to give fire to the Match at both ends, the Jesuits, by means of a Person named *Garon* (who makes shew of much devotion), would fain have prescribed unto the Curates of the Parishes in *Paris*,
a form

a form of preaching the very last Lent, giving them in writing sundry Discourses tending to Sedition. But divers honest Curates came to the Duke of *Sully*, beseeching him, that by his means they might speak with the King; to whom they made their Complaints, saying, There are some that would prescribe them to preach things contrary to their Allegiance. The excessive Clemency of this great King contented it self with making remonstrance hereof unto Father *Gontier*; yea, and to win his heart, he made him his Preacher, and gave him a Pension.

Like as before Lightning a man shall hear some grumbling in the Clouds: even so, these Preachings and Seditious Meetings were the forerunners of this great blow, that hath shaken this State in the Person of so great a King, whose loss we lament now, but shall feel it much more in the time to come.

Add hereunto the Confession of *Ravillac*, who justified unto Father *Aubigny*, that he had told him in confession, That he had been sent to give a great stroke, and that he shewed him the Knife, having an heart graven upon it. But the said Jesuit protested, that God had given him this grace, that so soon as ought was revealed unto him in Confession, he forgot it incontinently. The Gallant saved his life by this: but had he been in another Country, he would have been taught the Art of Memory.

They that have sounded this *Ravillac*, and have been present at his Examination, may perceive that the said Parricide hath been (very) thoroughly instructed in this matter: for in every other Point of Divinity he shewed himself most ignorant; but only in the Question, *Whether it be lawful to kill a Tyrant?* He was well skilled in all manner of Evasions and Jesuitical Distinctions, as my Lords the Commissioners can testify, the *Sieur Coeffeteau*,

*This is so be
found in the
Records.*

A Refutation of Cotton's Letter

Doctor of Divinity, and others, who had the Examination of this *Ravillac* in this matter. And this Parricide being demanded what moved him to this Attempt, told them more than once, *What the causes were, why it was requisite to kill the King, they might understand by the Sermons of the Preachers.* His meaning was, that he was induced hereunto by the Sermons before mentioned. But (more than this) it was easie to perceive, that besides publick Exhortations, he had (withal) received particular Instructions at large, so well seen was he in this Argument.

Neither is it a Circumstance to be neglected, that Father *Cotton*, having obtained leave to speak with *Ravillac* in Prison, amongst other things that he spake unto him, this was one; *Look well to it, that you accuse not the innocent:* fearing (belike) lest he should accuse the Jesuits: but the *Cordeliers*, *Carmelites*, and other honest religious Persons, who were not touched in Conscience, they feared not, lest any should accuse them.

But whence was it, that at *Bruxelles*, and at *Prague*, where the Jesuits domineer, the King's death was spoken of (some) twelve or fifteen days before it came to pass? At *Roan* divers received Letters from their Friends at *Bruxelles*, desiring to be informed, whether the Report that went of the King's death were true, albeit at that time it was not so.

Monsieur *Argentier* at *Troyes*, received Letters from the Tutor of his Children at *Prague*, wherein he was advertised, that a Jesuit had given it forth, that the King was dead before it fell out to be so; and withal had told them, that after his decease Monsieur the *Dolphin* should not be King, but the King of *Spain*, and that for the same reasons which Father *Gontier* gave in his Sermons at Advent and Lent last.

I may

I may not omit the Prediction of the Provost of *Petiviers*, (who was found strangled in Prison) who being at *Periviers*, two days journey from *Paris*, and playing at Nine-pins, amongst sundry of his Friends, told them, saying, *This day the King is either slain, or hath a blow*. This Provost was in faction a Jesuit, and had committed a Son of his unto them, who at this day is a Jesuit. Divers have observed with what disdain, and general indignation it was taken of every one, to see the Jesuits at the *Louvre*, the (very) morning after this abominable Assassination, looking with a smiling and presumptuous Countenance, as who should say, all things went well for them; and to be presented to the Queen by Monsieur de la Varenne, their Benefactor and Restorer, and to have that boldness in this common heaviness and sorrow, so speedily to demand the Heart of the poor deceased King, which they carried away in a kind of a Conquest, wherewithal they had done well to have buried also the Tooth which *John Chastet*, a Disciple of theirs, struck out some years since.

But who did not wonder to see all the Orders of religious Persons assist at this Funerals of the King, and partake of the common sorrow, saving the Jesuits, who alone having received more good turns of this good King, than all other Ecclesiastical Persons put together, even they alone vouchsafed not to accompany his Body unto the Grave. Which being observed by divers of the Spectators, some said, the reason of their absence was, because they disdain'd all other Orders to be the most ridiculous; their Opinion was, that it was no small part of their Wisdom: and that *Therius* and *Julia*, having procured the poisoning of *Germanicus*, in the public mourning that was at *Rome*, would not appear openly, for fear lest the People should discover their sorrow to be but false and counterfeit.

Tacitus, lib. 3. Annal. *Tiberius* atque *Augusta* publico abstinere, inferius majestate sua rati, si palam lamentarentur, an ne omnium oculis vultum eorum scrutantibus, falsi intelligerentur.

After

After the King's death, they did what they could to keep his Purpose from taking effect, and to thwart such Courses as he judged to be for the good of the State. He had resolved to send Companies unto *Cleves*, for aid to the Princes of *Germany*. Since that, Monsieur, the Marshal of *Castres*, General of these Forces, prepared himself for the Journey, when behold two Jesuits, who came to seek him out, told him that he could not go this Voyage, nor bring Succour unto Hereticks with a good Conscience, and sought to affright his Conscience with threats, as that if he did this, he could not be saved. But the said Marshal giving no credit unto their words, within a while after, they come unto him to change their language, and to appease him.

CHAP. IV.

An Examination of the Declaratory Letter of Father Cotton.

FIRST of all, I say, That this Letter being extorted (as it is) by necessity, comes out of season, and doth not prevent the evil, but comes after it: for it should have been written against *Mariana*, when he first peeped forth, and when the late King intreated Father Cotton to write against it. I say further, It is utterly unknown to us, whether he speak in earnest in his Letter, or whether according to the Doctrine of his Order, he useth Equivocation, and suppresseth the one half of his meaning: or if he speaks in good earnest, who seeth not that his Companions are not of his opinion, for none of them hath subscribed his Book, nor approved it, which yet had been most requisite

requisite in a matter so publick, and of such importance.

Again, The Authority of so many Jesuits condemning the murdering of Kings, is alledged by him in vain: for all such Passages of the Jesuits are understood of Kings whom the Pope and Jesuits acknowledg for Kings: But we have made it clear in the former Chapters by the Authority of a great many Jesuits, and by their Actions, That when the Jesuits do attempt upon the Life of any King, they make good their Action by this, That such a one they do not reckon to be a King, albeit he bears the name, in as much as he is excommunicated, or because he is an Enemy unto the Church: and in very deed this wretched *Ravillac* alledged this for the cause of his Attempt, to wit, *because the King would make war against the Pope, and that the Pope was God, and by consequence, that the King would make war against God.*

These are the very words of the Interrogatory.

And therefore the Reverend Abbot of *Boys*, hath well observed in his Answer to Father *Cotton*, That whereas *Gregory of Valence*, Jesuit, saith, *It is no way permitted for a man to attempt upon the Life of his Prince, albeit he abuse his Authority*; yet he adds, *If it be not done by publick Judgment.* Now all the Jesuits maintain, that the Judgment of the General of their Order is a publick Judgment, and whereon they must rest (themselves) as on the Voice of Christ, as we have shewed before; we hold also the Judgment of the Pope to be a publick Judgment.

Again, We have formerly observed, that the Apology of *Eudemon-Johannes*, the Jesuit, approved by their General *Aquaviva*, and of three Doctors of the Jesuits; affirms that Jesuits do no way approve the murdering of Kings, notwithstanding they love the event; so that it serves to no purpose for Father *Cotton* to condemn him that

A Refutation of Cotton's Letter

that murdered the King, if nevertheless he be glad for the event, that is to say, for the death of the King.

And in very deed, it is a fraudulent Protestation that he makes, of approving the Decree of the Council of *Constance*, where they condemn the Proposition of *John Petit*, and declare that it is not lawful for a Subject to kill a Tyrant: for the Jesuits have their Evasion ready, and which is a truth, namely, that the Council of *Constance* speaketh of such Tyrants as are lawful Kings, and that they speak not of Tyrants deposed by publick Judgment, and whose Subjects are discharged and absolved of their Oath of Allegiance by the Pope; nor of Kings, who are judged Enemies unto the Church. For if the Jesuits shall undertake to make away a King, they will easily find (out) some reason (or other) to prove that he is no King at all, and by consequence that (herein) they do nothing against the Council of *Constance*, nor against those places which Father *Cotton* alledged out of the Writings of the Jesuits.

That which Father *Cotton* adds, That this was the singular opinion of *Mariana*, and not of all their Order, hath been disproved in the first Chapter, by the approbation of a great many Jesuits, whose names are in the front of *Mariana's* Book, and by the Books of sundry Jesuits, who affirm the same that *Mariana* doth; yea, they commend him, and maintain him: and the Jesuit *Cotton* (himself) doth so tenderly condemn him, that in his reprehensions of him, he doth rather seem to flatter him.

As for that pretended decision, which he would make us believe to have been made in a Provincial Congregation of the Jesuits, wherein *Mariana* was condemned by them: this seems to me, to mar their Market, since they have concealed this Decision (hitherto) and would

have no man know it. Did they fear to make *Frenchmen* too well affected towards the preservation of the King? or did they fear to give offence to the Jesuits of *Spain*, by publishing their condemnation of *Mariana*? Out of doubt it will be found that either any such decision was never made, or if it were, it was a matter of (mere) Equivocation, and ambiguous (construction.)

And this will be more easily believed when a man shall come near, and observe the Jesuits confession in this matter, which Father *Cotton* hath reduced to fifteen heads or Articles, which are nothing but infoldings of words, and which declare the Jesuits belief in such points whereof no man asks them any question: for behold, (these are the Points) whereon we would expect to hear the Confession of their Faith.

I. Whether, when the Superiour of the Jesuits shall command them to undertake against the King, they ought to obey him?

II. Whether the Pope can discharge Subjects of their Oath of Allegiance made unto their King?

III. Whether a King, being deposed by the Pope, and excommunicated, is nevertheless a King? and whether the Subjects are bound nevertheless to perform obedience to him in things temporal after excommunication?

IV. Whether, in case some good Catholick shall discover unto a Jesuit in Confession his purpose to kill the King, the Jesuit ought to reveal this Confession, or conceal it?

V. Whether the Pope can give and take away Kingdoms, and at his pleasure transfer them? namely, whether the Jesuits do approve that Canon which saith, that the Pope may take off the Crown from a King's head, albeit he be without blame?

H

VI. Whe-

A Refutation of Cotton's Letter

VI. Whether Kings are above Clerks : that is to say, Whether the King hath authority over their goods, and over their lives, as much as over his other Subjects?

VII. Whether Faith given to the Enemies of the Church, be to be kept?

VIII. Whether a Jesuit, being accused of Treason, and kept Prisoner thereupon, may lawfull use Equivocations in his Answer?

IX. Whether, to slay a Man's Enemies, it be lawful for him to kill his Friends?

X. Whether the Rebellion of a Clergy-man against the King be High-treason?

XI. Whether a man can hate him that murthereth a King, and yet be glad for the event?

XII. Whether *Garnet* and *Oldcorne* are Martyrs? and whether *Guignard* were justly condemned to death?

These are the Points, whereon all honest Catholicks desire the Jesuits might be catechised; and that it would please the *Queen Regent*, and my Lords the Princes of the Blood, the Officers of the Crown, and Lords of the Council, to command *Father Cotton*, and his Companions, to write their minds clearly, and to set forth their Confession, to the end these new impressions which enfeeble the Authority of our Kings, and hazard their lives, might be razed out of (the minds of) the People, instead of giving us Articles which touch not the matter, and which (withal) are carried in obscure and doubtful terms, like unto the Sword of *Delphos*, which cuts on both sides.

The first Article is this: *All Jesuits (saith he) in general and in particular, are ready to seal even with their own blood, that they have not either in this matter or other, any other Faith, Doctrine and Opinion, than that of the Church of Rome.* Herein he speaks against his Con-

science: for if all Jesuits in particular are agreed in every thing, it follows that *Cotton* and *Mariana* do agree together, and that *Cotton* doth not well to condemn him. Whereas he saith, that all the Jesuits are ready to subscribe, that in this matter they have no other belief than the Universal Church hath. I answer, That the Jesuits may easily subscribe to any thing that a man would have them, since they have their retention, and secret conditions, which they reserve in their minds: but I am well assured that the Universal Church will not subscribe to any of those abominable Positions of the Jesuits, which we have formerly alledged out of their Books, much less will it approve their Actions.

His second Article is: *That amongst all kinds of Governments and administrations of Commonwealths, a Monarchy is the best.* To what purpose is this? It is not necessary that they who esteem a Monarchy to be better than a Democracy, for this cause, must make scruple to destroy Kings: or that they who desire to kill the King, must have an intention to change the form of Government; but only they desire another King, because he that lives, dislikes them.

The third Article favours altogether of the Jesuits vein, and of their terms, for therein is nothing but Equivocations, and mental Reservations. It saith, *That such as is the spiritual Government of the Church, which relies on the Vicar of Jesus Christ, the Successor of St. Peter; such is the temporal of the State and Kingdom of France, that it determines in the person of the King, our Sovereign Lord and Master.* There is nothing spoken to the full in this, but with much dissimulation: for he dares not affirm, that the King is as simply absolute in his Kingdom, as the Pope in the Church: for the Jesuits alone maintain, that the Pope can depose Kings; but they do not maintain,

A Refutation of Cotton's Letter

that Kings may depose Popes: They hold that Popes can discharge Subjects of their obedience unto Kings; but they do not hold that Kings can dispence with Christians touching their obedience unto Popes: They hold that the Pope's power reacheth unto the temporalities of Kings, either directly, as some say, or indirectly, as others say; but they do not believe that Kings have any power either directly or indirectly, over the spiritualities or temporalities of Popes: They hold that there are many Persons in *France* that are not liable to trial before the Kings Judges; but they do not hold, there is any man within the Territories of *St. Peter* who is not triable before the Officers of his Holiness: They hold that the Pope can levy money and rents upon the Ecclesiastical Revenues of the Kingdom of *France*; but they do not hold that the Kings of *France* can levy any money upon the Persons, or upon the Lands of *Italy*, which are of the Patrimony of *St. Peter*.

For it is not credible that Father *Cotton* will oppose himself against Cardinal *Bellarmin* the Jesuit, all the Jesuits now a-days being his Disciples and Scholars, who in his fifth Book, *De Pontifice Romano*, and sixth Chapter, writes thus: *The Pope may change Kingdoms, take them from one, and bestow them on another, as the supreme Prince spiritual, and when he shall find it necessary for the salvation of Souls.* Of whom also we have formerly learned that Kings are not above Clerks. The same (Author) in the second Chapter of his Book, *Of the exemption of the Clergy*, calls all Kings and Princes in general, *Prophane men*: And he holds in divers places, *That the power of secular Princes, is but an humane Institution, and is only the work of men.* Albeit the Apostle in the thirteenth to the Romans, saith; *That there is no power but of God, and the powers that be, are ordained of God.*

Quis dicere
audeat jus esse
profano in ea
quæ sancta
sanctorum, id
est, sanctissi-
ma dici me-
ruerum?

God. And therefore it is no part of the Jesuits belief, to account Kings to be Kings in such sort, as the Pope is the head of the Church, seeing they are not Kings but by humane Institution: but the Pope is head of the Universal Church by the Institution of God. In a word, *Cotton* speaks but with half a mouth, and by that which he saith, it is impossible to apprehend what he believeth. And the same may be said of his other Articles.

The last Article is a recrimination of those of the pretended Reformed Religion, sundry of whose Books he saith are infected with this Opinion, That it is lawful for a Subject to make away his King. After this he adds; *I could note and specify the places, alledg their words, were it not much better that they should remain swallowed up of the gulf of forgetfulness.* Oh what matter of triumph here doth he give unto our Adversaries? whose saying will be, that if *Father Cotton* had known those places, he would not have failed to bring them to light, and it had been good to name the Books, that they might be suppressed, and the Authors punished, if they were living.

Now hereupon I have been moved in the humor of curiosity to inform my self: and enquiring of some of the contrary Religion, men not unlearned, they have answered me, That indeed the Council of *Constance*, in the eighth Session, makes an enumeration of *Wickliff's* Heresies, and amongst other things accuseth him for being of opinion, that *no man is a Master or Lord in civil things, during his continuance in mortal sin.* Again, That *People* may at their pleasure correct Princes that are faulty. And that *Buchanan* an Historian and *Scotish* Poet, in his Book, *De jure Regni apud Scotos*, speaketh (indeed) of handling Kings roughly, and driving them out, when they become Tyrants. But the Council of *Constance* slandereth *Wickliff*, not only in this point, but also in divers others,

Artic. 15. Nihilus est Dominus dum est in peccato mortali, &
Artic. 17. Populares possunt ad arbitrium suum dominos delinquentes corrigere.

others : that this is no-where to be found throughout his Writings : and that he was not present to answer for himself : that after the same slanderous manner, the same Council chargeth him to have said, that *God must obey the Devil* : that *Buchanan* was no Divine : that amongst their Doctors there are indeed found some free Speeches against Kings that persecute their Churches, so far as to say, that notwithstanding their wicked wills, they will not give over to advance the Work of God, and such like. But not so much as any one word is to be found of advice to kill Kings, nor so much as any one Precept of Rebellion. That *Luther* writ indeed against King *Henry* the Eighth of *England*, in most contemptuous sort, and indiscreet terms : but that *Luther* was none of his Subject, and that he never spake of killing Kings, nor of rebelling against their Sovereign, and therefore that these Examples are not to purpose.

This I say, not that I rest satisfied with these Justifications, I leave them as they are, but to stir up Father *Cotton* to speak more plainly unto this point, for fear lest our Adversaries should say, that they are accused without proof, and without shewing wherefore.

That which remains of Father *Cotton's* Declaratory Letter, is only a Declamatory Discourse, wherein he talks of *Otaconstes*, *Profagogides*, and *Quadruplators* : words that had given us the stop, had they been put in the entrance (of his Discourse.) For these are words too hard for us, that know no other Latin than that of *Accursius*, and that busie our selves to prove as good *Frenchmen*, as the Jesuits are good *Spaniards*.

C H A P. V.

Whether it be for the good of the State, that Father Cotton should be near about the person of the King, or of the Queen Regent? and whether the Jesuits are to be suffered?

IF all the World wonders to see, after the blow that *John Chastel* gave with a Knife, after the condemning of the Jesuits, after the erection of the Pyramis for a memorial, yet nevertheless a little after (all this) these Fathers to be established again, and to possess the heart of the King, whose mouth they had slit: So is it a thing as much to be wondred at, to see at this day, after so horrible a death, those, who have set abroad the Doctrine of murdering (Princes) and who are known to have a finger in the Action, to continue still, and to be near about the person of the King.

I will believe that the person of *Father Cotton* is free from this Crime, and that *Father Gontier* and *Aubigny* had no communication with him, and that he had no intelligence with the Jesuits of *Bruxelles*: yet such are his manners and his profession, that it is no way fit, nor for (the) credit (of the Court) for him to come near about the person of his Majesty.

First of all, I affirm, That *Cotton*, who calls himself a religious Person, yea, of such a Company who take unto them the name of Jesus, is a scandal to the whole Church, being every day a follower of the Court: for this is a thing contrary, not only to the Institution of all Monks, but particularly to the rules of the Jesuits, as *Father Richeome* assureth us in his Apologetical complaint: and *Cardinal Tolet* the Jesuit, in his Book, *Of the Institution*

A Refutation of Cotton's Letter

Institution of Priests, 1st Book, and 40th Chapter, holds it for a general truth, That a religious Person, who betakes himself unto the Courts of Princes, is an excommunicate Person, albeit he hath leave of his Superior.

Secondly, For the imprinting of Vertue in the heart of a Prince, it is fit to set about his Person men that are Enemies unto Vices, and such as will not flatter him in his Imperfections. This was one of the (great) faults of Father *Cotton*, even his connivence at the Pleasures of the late King, instead of withdrawing him from them. And such a Prince was he, that if a man, an enemy unto Vice, had held his place about him, it had been an easie matter to restrain him. This is the complaint that Father *Portugais*, lately made in our hearing, in a Funeral Sermon that he preached at St. *James* in the Shambles, and which afterwards he set forth in print.

Yet this is not all : for instead of restraining him, he rather humoured him, affirming even at a full Sermon, that his Majesty made amends for his Sins with many Merits : that *David* committed faults, although he were a man after God's own heart.

(Nay) he did much worse than this : for he was the Messenger of the King's love, and carried his Love-letters unto Ladies : a great Prince of this Kingdom, and who now lives in Court, can testify, that (as he told him) (how) he wondred at this, that Father *Cotton* should be employed in bringing a certain Damsel unto the King : the same Jesuit answered him, that indeed it was a sin, but that he was rather to regard the health of the King, whose life was so necessary unto the Church ; and that this evil should be recompenced with a greater good.

And for his life ; therein he hath discovered egregious Hypocrisie. He vaunted (sometimes) in the presence of sundry Lords of the Court, who yet are living, that
since

since he was two and twenty years of Age, he never committed any mortal Sin; and yet nevertheless, the Abbot of *Boyse* hath justified unto him, and is ready to justify it, that since that time it is that a Sentence hath passed against him at *Avignon*, for getting a Nun with child. Monsieur *des Bordes*, Lord of *Grigny*, a Man that wants no good part, save to be a Catholick, hath lying by him at this day Father *Cotton's* (Love) Letters unto *Madamoyselle de Clavansac de Misme*, written with his own hand: wherein, after many protestations of friendship, he tells her, That he hopes to see her shortly, to pay her the principal, and the arrearages of his absence: and that the affection he bears to her, is such, that he cannot promise himself to have full joy in Paradise, if he find not her there. This Damsel was entred amongst the Questions which this Jesuit was to propose unto the Devil.

Who doth not wonder at the incredible Impudence of this Man, who insinuates himself every-where, and shrinks not back for an hundred puttings by? who thrusts himself into every Action, who makes himself a Companion to Princes; who, in the Meditations he sets forth, seems as if he would flatter God, and bring him a-sleep with words that savour of his Queen? What an heart-burning would it be to see a Caitiff Jesuit besiege the Spirit of a King, and to be, as a man may say, tied to his Girdle, while in the mean time, Princes and Lords, who have done him great service, have much a-do to come near him? I cannot conceive any reason why other of the Clergy, who for many Ages have been the Pillars of the Church of *France*, who never laid hand on their Kings, and who never abandoned them in their Afflictions, especially in the (time of our) last Troubles, should not enjoy the same favour that these new-come

A Refutation of Cotton's Letter

Upstarts, who are not subject to any Bishop, but immediately depending of their *Spanish* General, and of their Consistory: and who have been already driven forth for the Crime of Parricide: Have not other Religious Orders better deserved to be Confessors unto the King, or Preachers unto the Queen; whose Confessions these Men will write into *Spain*, to some Provincial at *Castile*, or to their General at *Rome*?

And if in seven or eight years, since their revocation, they have bestir'd themselves so well, that in divers parts of *France*, they have gotten above an hundred thousand Crowns of Rent, and built in divers places, especially at *la Fleche*, an House, that comes to above an hundred thousand Crowns; what will they do, if they continue but twenty years more? This is a Canker that still gets ground. They cannot be in a place, but they must domineer too: they have already built an House for Novices in the Suburbs of *St. Germanes*; a pretty Town might stand within the Precincts of it: and there the Rector of the University shall have nothing to do, but to look on; and from thence are they like to draw all the Youth, as being more subtle than others to insinuate into mens Houses, to please Women given to devotion, to flatter their Children, to take neither for washing nor Candles of their Scholars, so they may swallow Lands, and whole Inheritances: whence it will come to pass, that the University of *Paris* shall be but a shadow, and assuredly come to nothing. From hence in ten years space, the Privy Council, and Courts of Parliament, and the great Council, shall be full of the Disciples of the Jesuits, and the rest of the Clergy shall no more be made reckoning of: for they have a purpose to bring them lower, and they speak contemptuously of them, as of ignorant Persons: and yet I have heard of
many

many that are learned, and particularly of *Monsieur*, the Cardinal of *Parron*, that themselves are ignorant Persons, and that they will overthrow Learning. For the restoring whereof, my Lord, the said Cardinal, hath a purpose to erect a new College in the University, where he will raise (the study of good) Letters, which are fallen, since these Men have soyled them, by reducing them unto a miserable kind of Scholasticism, and making them to consist of slender Observations which themselves have gathered.

(Yet) this were but a small matter, were it not that by bringing up Scholars, and making men learned, they hereby grasp the State, and go about to bring Kings under a Tutorship, and stir up People unto Sedition; and if they were as ready to rise, as these are base to solicit them, *France* by this had run over with blood, and the death of the King had been followed with Massacres both of the one, and of the other Religion: for this was their hope in this cursed Parricide: from which, if this blow cannot keep them from falling, they will easily find the means to renew their Party.

In the mean while, let my Lords of the Council, and my Masters of the Courts of Parliaments, judge whether with a good Conscience they can permit the hearing of Confessions unto them, who have sworn to reveal nothing, tho it necessarily concern to the preservation of the King: and whether it be not fit to force them from so damnable a Doctrine, that makes them culpable of High-treason? To what purpose serves it to burn a Book by the Executioner, while the (Persons themselves) are suffered? and to execute a piece of Paper, while in the mean time a man dares not name the Jesuits, for fear to offend them? Let them consider whether they will be glad to see the ruine of the University of *Paris*, which ever since *Charles the Great*, hath been the Ornament of this Kingdom;

dom; or whether in suffering the encrease of these, and their establishment in the Court, they can be content to hold the King's faithful Catholicks in defiance, and in expectation to behold yet a third Parricide. Let them be forbidden to intermeddle in Affairs of State: let them preach the Gospel, and the Commandments of the Church: Let Parents be bound to send their Children unto Colleges in the University: let there not be two distinct Universities: let enquiry be made what the Jesuits do with all their Wealth, seeing it is well known they are but few in number, and that they do not spend it neither upon Apparel, nor on Horses, nor upon Servants. To what end then serves all their Revenues, save to make Voyages, and Commissions for strange Countries, and to make a Store-house that may serve to wage the Enemies of the State, and contribute to the Charges of some Rebellion: as they did in the last League? For I find the *Polander* had reason, when he said that the Society of the Jesuits was a Sword, whose Scabbard was in *France*, but the Handle of it in *Spain*, or at *Rome*, where the General of the Jesuits abides; for the first motion to draw this Sword comes from thence.

This is it we had to say on this matter; whereunto my desire is, that answer should be made from Point to Point: or rather, that we would open our Eyes unto these Considerations, which are most clear and needful. And if in doing this we shall procure more hatred than we shall gain commodity, yet this shall be our comfort, That we have not failed in our duty of proposing things necessary for the good of the State, and for the peace and safety of the Church.

R I O N I S

THE
SUPPLICATION
OF THE
UNIVERSITY of *PARIS*,

For the preventing of the JESUITS opening of their Schools there.

Wherein their KING-KILLING DOCTRINE
is also opened and refuted.

NOTATION

ENTRANCE

ENTRANCE

ENTRANCE

ENTRANCE

ENTRANCE

ENTRANCE

ENTRANCE

T O T H E

Queen Regent:

The Lords, the Princes of the Blood:

And the Lords of the Council.

May it please your Majesty :

THE University of *Paris* in all humility desires to make it known to your Majesty, That the Doctrine of the killing of Kings by Assassins, who of Devotion destiné themselves to death, as to a Martyrdom pleasing to God, is by us held to be a pestilent Device, never seen nor read in the Records of Antiquity; nor so much as known to the Ancient Pagans, or Christians. Among the *Mahumetans*, one alone (named *the Old Man of Montagne*) is found to have put it into practice; but the rest of that Sect crushed it in the Egg, and never since did the same, notwithstanding their malice against Christian Princes be no way abated: Only about sixty years ago, this Poyson spread it self in the veins
of

The Supplication of

of Christendom, and began to be put in execution in *England*, and in *France*; we say in *England*, inasmuch as in regard of Civil and Temporal Obedience due to Kings, and as to the safety of their lives, all Christian Princes, though Pagans, Hereticks, Idolaters, Infidels, Excommunicates, Apostates, are notwithstanding, unto us, holy and sacred, as the Apostles teach, and the primitive Christian Church, and the Examples of Saints, now in Heaven, sometime Prelates and Bishops of *France*. Now this hellish Position of theirs is grounded upon another erroneous Doctrine, which is the Pope's Omnipotency, whom we acknowledg Head of the Church, in that manner and meaning as our Predecessors have done. The Doctrine of this Omnipotency is not at all to be found in the Divinity of *Paris*, nor in the Bosome of the University, but we find it in the Sermons and Writings of the Jesuits, and in the Answers of Assassins at their Arraignment before the Judges.

To put this matter out of doubt, we need no more, than to hear themselves speaking. *Parrie*, who undertook the murdering of *Elizabeth*, Queen of *England*, maintained that he might lawfully do it, she standing excommunicate by the Pope, and consequently her life abandoned. *Catesby*, the Undertaker of the Fire-work, which should have blown up the King of great *Britain*, the Queen, their Children, and the States, stood to it, that the Enterprize was holy: For since *Clement the Eighth*, by two Briefs, forbade the Catholics to receive him, they had better reason (as he thought) to make him away, being received. *John Chastel* affirmed, That he thought it a meritorious work to kill our last King, because, that although the Bishops of *France* had received him into the Church, yet he was not in it, the Pope having not admitted him. *Ravillac* the last Parricide,

Parricide affirmed that *the King undertook the last war against the good will of the Pope; that God was the Pope, and the Pope God, by vertue of those words, Thou art Peter, and upon this rock, &c.* Hereupon the Bishop of *Clere-mont*, one of their disciples, failed not after the execution of the murtherer to be present at the Assembly of the *Sor-bon*, which was called (accordingly as our Ancestors had chalked us out the way) for the censuring and condemning of that murthering doctrine; where turning himself from company to company, before the sitting of the Doctors, he told them they should take heed what they did, for you have here (saith he) two of the Popes Nuncio's; and the Company being set, he told them, that the question then to be discussed had been diversly handled, and that in his judgement it was needful they should propose it to the Popes Nuncio's, who might give notice of it to the Pope their Master; as if none other Kings were to live but whom it pleased the Pope.

After that many good Preachers of this University had contested against the murders of Kings, and the broachers and abettors of that doctrine, at last Father *Cotton* presents your Majesty with a Letter declaratory, of the doctrine of the Jesuits in that behalf, in which he labours to give contentment to such as complain that their writings maintain these three doctrines cousin-germans, The omnipotency of the Pope, and from thence depending Rebellion against Kings, and Abandoning of their lives, when they, or such as themselves, shall judge them Tyrants: but men of understanding sufficiently perceive the Equivocations and Fallacies wherewithal they would shadow their mischievous doctrine, following herein the use and practise of that position whereof their Sect makes open profession in treatises expressly allowed by the General of their Order; as may be seen in

The Supplication of

the Apology made in the behalf of *Henry Garnet* in the Chapter of Equivocations: yet should we be loath to discover them, and to hinder their counterfeit coin from being currant for some profit which might from thence arise; were it not that by the vertue of these ambiguities, that Sect hopes to get the start of us in opening their Schools in the University of *Paris*, against the settled and resolved determination of the last King. In regard whereof this University, daughter of the French Kings, should hold her self guilty of disloyalty if she did not unmask those fallacies, and become an humble petitioner to your Majesty to provide that this daughter (most faithful to her Liège as long as she is kept from being forced) be not stained with the company of that sect which hath long since been found to be most dangerous to our State.

He then would make your Majesty believe, that the writers of his Order affirm, That it is not lawful to kill a Tyrant; but they by him alledged, and by name *Valentia* (their late great Doctor) adds this restriction: *if it be not done by publick judgment*; and to the end you may not be ignorant what is meant by that publick judgment, he afterward lays you down certain articles of the doctrine of the Jesuits, touching the Sovereignty of Kings, in fashion as followeth: *That a Monarchy is the best kind of government: That the Pope is a Monarch in the Church for the spiritual government, as the King is in his Kingdom for the Temporal*; as not allowing the King to be King in his own Kingdom, if the Pope be not absolute Sovereign in the Spiritual Affairs of the Church. But may it please your Majesty to be informed, That this is an assertion directly opposite to the doctrine of the Church, which your University of *Paris* hath always stood for: namely, to affirm that the Pope
hath

hath Monarchical power in the Church : for they are indeed contradictory speeches, to maintain, that a Council is above the Pope, (as your University hath always done) and that the Pope is absolute Monarch of the Church. This doctrine of your University, if ever it were necessary, surely now a days it is more useful than ever, as well in regard of our own King, as of all the States of Christendom.

Now what are the effects of this absolute spiritual Monarchy, he clears in another Book which he hath dedicated to your Majesty, the Princes of the blood, and the Lords of the Council ; you shall find it in the end of the second Tome of his *Institutions, Quest. 35.* where he affirms, that *The Pope hath no absolute power to command and dispose the Crowns of Kings* : but his fallacy lyes in this word [*absolute*] in as much as he hath power to put off and put on the Crowns of Kings, but that power is not Absolute : The King, and your Majesty, and the Lords pretend not an absolute power to dispose of the goods of your Subjects, but onely by the rule and guidance of Justice. Moreover Father *Cotton* a little after affirms, That the Pope by vertue of his Spiritual Government, and for the uniting of Religion and the State, may by the power of his Ecclesiastical Censures dispose of Princes Crowns, *for the service of God, the good of the Church, and the salvation of souls.* Neither is this any peculiar point, which himself alone defends, but it is the common tenet of that Society : but this doctrine of the uniting, as he terms it, of Religion and the State, or the Church and the Common-wealth, is meerly opposite to the doctrine of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath for ever put a separation between the Church and the State, in

The Supplication of

those words, *Give unto God that which is Gods*, that is to say, Religious Service; and *unto Cæsar that which belongs unto Cæsar*; that is, civil obedience, honour, homage, tribute.

May it please your Majesty, your University of *Paris* hath never taught otherwise, holding her self fast to the ancient Councils, and rejecting the new, in that wherein they reject this wholsome doctrine. And this is it in which the Kings, the Bishops of *France*, the Courts of Parliament, the King's Council, the French Doctors, and lastly, this your University, have always held the Liberties of the French Church and Kingdom to consist. And surely, it is no small question which we have now in hand, no less worth than the estate of the King, which these men leave to the mercy of the Pope, these men I say, to whose charge the training up of our youth is every where committed, the consciences of the people in their confessions, and by their Sermons and Writings the instruction of all. Notwithstanding that in the mean while the life of the King, and that of your Majesty, are in hazard, in as much as when the Pope withdraws the right of government from a Prince, they hold him presently for a Tyrant, as usurping against the determination of that Publick Authority, which according to the Jesuits doctrine, may of a King make a Tyrant: nay, they farther affirm, that Subjects may rebel against their Sovereign, altho he be not excommunicate, if they believe, that those who should do it, fearing his greatness, durst not. This is the doctrine of the Jesuit *Suarez*, who by that means puts the estates and lives of the most potent Princes into the greatest Perplexity. Such is also the practice of some murtherers of Kings, men who acknowledge the Omnipotency of the Pope taught by the Jesuits, and indeed acknowledg none other, but so far forth as it pleaseth.

seth the Pope; and this was apparently the practice of that last wretched Parricide, as it was clear by that execrable discourse which he held with those Divines, who were sent to confer with him, unto whom he shewed himself to have been perfectly skilled in all the shifts and cavils, which Sophistry it self could possibly invent, touching that Subject; this Man, I say, was thus cunning in this Point, who was otherwise devoid of all good literature, and almost common understanding.

We make no doubt, but if it would please your Majesty to consult the Pope in this Point, he would be drawn to perform that, which he ought, in condemning by his Bulls to Hell-pit such Murtherers and Assassins, and by stopping (which might be done by a word of his Mouth) the torrent of those mischiefs, which cast a shame and obloquy upon the innocency of Christian Religion: For the power which these Men have hitherto had at *Rome*, hath given occasion to some to give out, That since he labours not to prevent these Mischiefs, acted by them, upon whom he may work what he list, it cannot be avoided, but himself must needs be thought to be the Author of them, as the Rules of Justice require.

The pretence which *Cotton* draws from the good of the Church, thereby to draw to the Pope power to dispose of Kingdoms, is but a colourable pretext: For by vertue of that separation, which our Lord Jesus Christ hath for ever made between Religion and the State, through the whole World where his Gospel should be preached, we stand obliged, notwithstanding all Ecclesiastical Censures, Interdicts, Dispensations for Oaths of Allegiance, or Commandments whatsoever from the Pope, not to take Arms against our Kings, but contrariwise, to yield them all civil and temporal obedience,

obedience, and for the safety of their lives, to hazard our own. This is the Law of Nature, ingraven in the hearts of men, even when they enter into this World, which the Son of God, cloathed with our Flesh, hath since established and consecrated, binding Christians to the observance of it in a straiter manner, than were the Pagans, led by the sole light of Nature, and Priests more strictly than Laicks, to whom they are to preach sound Doctrine, as well by words as example; and Bishops rather than ordinary Priests; and lastly, above all, the chief Bishop of all, because his Example in this case would more prevail than any other, nay, all the other beside. This was the true cause why the King of *Great Britain*, to preserve himself from these King-killers, was constrained to exact of his Subjects an Oath of Allegiance for their civil and temporal obedience, and the surety of his life, notwithstanding the Pope's Bulls.

An Oath which the frequent Doctrine and Practice of Assassins now a-days makes in a manner necessary through Christendom, to secure the Estates and Lives of God's Anointed, and withal to free the Catholick Apostolick *Roman* Religion toward the Kings and Princes of the Earth, from that blame and hatred which this wicked Doctrine draws with it, and to make it more gracious in the eyes of those who maintain a different Religion. Yet is this wholsom Doctrine more needful in *France* than any where beside, because the effects of the contrary fall especially upon the Life and Crown of the King. And rather now in the minority of our King, than in his full age, this erroneous Doctrine ought to be refused, and the Broachers thereof punished, because the Practice of the Ages past hath ever taught us, that when they would draw out their Censures against the Temporalities of Kings, they commonly set upon the weakest.

For

For these Reasons the University of *Paris*, Daughter of the Kings of *France*, most humbly beseecheth your Majesty, the Princes of the Blood, and the Lords of the Council, not to give way to the Jesuits (since they defend an Opinion touching the Pope's Omnipotency, and the safety of the Estates and Lives of Kings, quite contrary to that which this University hath always taught and maintained) to the opening of their Schools here in *Paris*, much less to their incorporating into the University, lest they make the Learning and Manners thereof as repugnant to the Estate of Kings, as is their own Sect, as may appear by those Writings which Father *Cotton* dedicates to you, and puts into your hands daily, and by that experience which we have found of them, and yet daily find in many quarters of Christendom; And the University shall ever be bound to pray for the establishment and happiness of the King, your Majesty, the Princes of the Blood, and the Lords of the Council.

F I N I S.

A
VINDICATION
OF
Anti-Cotton,
AGAINST THE
CAVILS
OF HIS
ANSWERS.

WHEN this little Treatise first appeared in the World, it was received with almost universal Applause. The barbarous Assassination of *Henry the Great*, and the general Detestation of that Society, whose Doctrine did Legitimate so great a Villany, had sufficiently disposed Mens minds for the Reception of it; and then the Freedom and Plainness of the Author, the Sharpness and Vehemency of his Expression, and the Publication of so many choice and surprizing Passages, easily gain'd it the Vogue and Esteem of all, who were not engag'd to the Interests, or prepossessed with the Principles of the Holy Order. At this the Society were alarm'd, they saw their pernicious Doctrines unfolded, their Intrigues unravel'd, and those Practises which they would have concealed in Darkness and

L

the

A Vindication of Anti-Cotton,

the Shadow of Death, expos'd to the open View of all Men. Something therefore was to be done to regain their Credit; a Book that could not be fairly answered, might yet be possibly run down with Noise and Confidence; and the want of strength in the Aggressors, be supplied in the number of them. *Gresler* in *Germany*, a Father of the Society in *France*; *Eudæmon Johannes* at *Rome*, are all imployed to confute our Author. The first of these I have not met with; the second Entitles his Book, *An Apologetical Answer to the Calumnies of Anti-Cotton*: In his Preface he Charges him with three hundred Lies, and two hundred Calumnies, Absurdities and Mistakes innumerable; and in the beginning of his Apology, quarrels him for entitling himself *Anti-Cotton*, and not *Anti-Jesuit*; and calling it a Book, and not an infamous Libel. Such severe Remarks as these, are every where to be met with in this Apologist; yet the Jesuits thought this Apology worth sending to King *James* to vindicate their Order. And the Learned *Isaac Casaubon* employ'd his Pen to confute it in an Amicable Epistle to *Fronto Ducaus*, a *French* Jesuit, who had been his intimate Friend. In this Epistle he fairly justifies the Charge of maintaining the lawfulness of King-killing against the Jesuits, and Answers the Cavils of the Apologist against the Citations of *Anti-Cotton*; and this he did so successfully, that the Jesuits (who always Calumniate, when they cannot Answer) endeavoured to run him down with Lies and Slanders upon himself, his Father, and whole Family; and declared him to be no Scholar, one that could not write *Latin*, and scarce understood it; yet his Answer to that Apologist contains both good *Latin*, and good Sense; sufficiently clears the main Point in dispute, and supercedes the use of any further Reply. And therefore (tho I shall not wholly neglect him, yet) I shall here more particularly apply my self to consider the Answer of *Eudæmon Johannes*, (which the Author of *Anti-Cotton*, with others, suspected to be a disguised Name, but afterwards it appeared to be his true one) a *Cretian* by Birth, but educated from his Youth among the Jesuits at *Rome*, where he was in some esteem with Cardinal *Bellarmin*, and *Urban* the 8th, and was therefore both by Education and Interest, engaged to assert the Deposing Doctrine, and all the other rebellious Maxims of that encroaching

See,

See, for which he is often Stigmatiz'd by our Author, and which he is so far from disowning in his Answer to him, that he more than once affirms it to be an Article of Faith, establish'd by the concurring Suffrages of Doctors, of Popes, and Councils, and universal Tradition. What this Author offers to refute the Charge of *Anti-Cotton*, I shall reduce to these three heads.

1. What he objects to the Charge of teaching the lawfulness of Deposing and Killing Kings. 2. What to that of some other of their Doctrines here imputed to them. And lastly, What he advances against the Matters of Fact contained in him. And

I. For the setting this whole Matter. in its true Light, it is requisite to lay down a Summary of the Jesuits Doctrine in this Point, that so it may be distinctly known what that is, whereof they are accused, and whether the Defence they make, be sufficient to discharge them.

1. Then, they carefully distinguish betwixt a Tyrant by Usurpation, and a Tyrant by Administration; one that has no Right and Title to the Crown, and one that is a Legitimate Prince, but governs Tyrannically; as to the former of these, 'tis their general Opinion, that such an Usurper may be lawfully killed by any private Person, and that here Killing is no Murder. But this is not allowed by *Azorius*, and he grounds his Dissent upon the Decree of the Council of *Constance*, which seems to condemn the other Opinion as impious and heretical; upon the Rules of Equity and Justice, which will not allow the condemning and executing, even the worst of Men, unheard; and upon the Laws of God and Nature, which are against private Mens usurping a Power of Life and Death, and executing that Vengeance which belongs only to God, and those whom he hath appointed to be the Ministers of it.

Mor. Inst. pars
2. l. 11. c. 5.
q. 10.

2. As to the other Species of Tyranny by Administration, they affirm, That a lawful Prince becomes a Tyrant, not only when he Governs contrary to Law and Justice, Oppresses and Destroys his Subjects, and subverts the Constitution of Civil Government: But also, when he invades the Rights and Immunities of the Clergy, or enacts Laws against the Church, or becomes a Persecutor of Catholics, and an Abettor of Heresy,

Page 6, 7, 8,
9, 10.

or does lastly refuse to own the Authority of Christ's Vicegerent, and withdraws his Obedience from the Successor of St. Peter. And concerning such a Tyrant, there are some of the Jesuits that have asserted it lawful for any private Person to destroy him; others require the publick Sentence of the States of any Kingdom to Authorise the Murder; but they unanimously agree in the ascribing to the Pope a Power of deposing him. The first of these is the known Opinion of *John Mariana*; the Author of *Anti-Cotton* has given us a large Account of this Man's horrid Divinity; and 'tis worth observing what variety of Shifts the Jesuits have used to discharge themselves of him. They lik'd the Man and his Doctrine well enough, but it was a little Scandalous, and all the World was alarm'd at it. At first, therefore, his Book pass'd Muster among

* *Step. Hoieda Visitator Societatis Jesu in Provincia Tolerana potestate speciali facta a N. patre Generali Claudio Aquaviva. Do facultatem ut imprimantur libri tres del'Rege & Regis institutione, quos scripsit & composuit P. Joh. Mariana ejusdem Societatis, quippe approbatis prius a viris gravibus & doctis ex eodem nostro ordine, in cuius rei fidem has literas dedi meo nomine subscrip'tas, & mei officii sigillo munitas. Madriti 4. Non. Dec. 1599. Vsd. Epist. Casaub. p. 42.*

them, and 'twas recommended to the World with as full an * Approbation as the Society ever gave to any of their Authors: and afterwards (as is shew'd in *Anti-Cotton*, and the Preface) it was applauded by several great Men of the Society, as conformable to the Sentiments of their Order, and containing nothing contradictory to the Catholick Faith. But when at length this Book became the Subject of Debate, was

made use of by their Enemies as a constant Topick of Reproach against them, was first universally decry'd, and then solemnly condemn'd by the *Sorbon*, and the Parliament of *Paris*; then it was thought requisite to dissemble their kindness to this Author, and for a while to seem to disapprove him. Father *Cotton* first in his declatory Letter publish'd 1610, styles him a rash and trifling Author, and then † produces a Condemnation of him from the same General, *Aquaviva*, by whose Authority he was before Licens'd, and in which yet the Name of *Marians* is not so much as mentioned; and the date of it is 1606, so that it lay concealed above four years, or (which is not improbable) was forg'd after the aforesaid Condemnation, and purposely antedated, that they might seem to be before-hand with

† *Thuani continuatione lib. 3. p. 100.*

with the *Sorbon* and the Parliament, and obviate the Suspicion of being forced to condemn him by the Exigency and Necessity of their Affairs. And yet, even after this pretended Sentence, they could not forbear to shew their kindness to him. Father Cotton's Apologist confesses that *Mariana* was indeed mistaken, when he said the Consent of the Learned was sufficient to authorise a private Man to destroy a Tyrant, and this is all he blames him for. *Eudæmon* is hard put to it, to excuse, and yet to disallow him. He says, p. 96. That the Opinion of *Mariana* is approv'd by no one else of the Society, and yet he had acknowledg'd before ||, that the Book was Licens'd by the ¶ Pag. 52. Visitor, and three of the Order; but this it may be is no good Argument that they allowed the Doctrine of it; for it has been clearly made out in the Case of *M. de Meaux*, that a good Catholick may give his Approbation for a Book, tho himself be of a different Opinion from it. But *Eudæmon* goes further, he gives a large account out of his Apology for Garnet, of *Mariana's* Opinion, where he says all he can to excuse him; That he delivers himself modestly and cautiously; that he seems not over-confident of his Doctrine; that he submits all to the Judgment of the Church, and professes he is ready to Recant if he be mistaken; and that therefore he cannot be guilty of heretical Obstinacy. He endeavours also to diminish the Odium of his Doctrine, by shewing it is not so bad as 'tis usually represented: That he does not allow a private Man at all Adventures to Murder every Prince he esteems a Tyrant; but that he must first be condemn'd as such by the Voice of all the People; that publick Judgment against him must be expected, if it can be procured; and that after all, if the States cannot Assemble to Condemn and Depose him, the Fact must not yet be attempted without the Approbation of the most Learned and Pious Men that can be consulted. And then, after he had given as fair a Representation of his Opinion as he possibly could, he makes this Reflection on it. ∴ *But these things, as they are gallantly and bravely Spoken, so they cannot be accommodated to the common Practice*; and so he goes on at large to Censure his Opinion, not as impious and detestable, but only as impolitick, rash and dangerous, and as a Speculation too subtile and refin'd to be reduc'd to Practice.

∴ Sed hæc ut splendide magnificèque dicuntur, ita ad communem Viræ usum accommodari non possunt. *Eud.*

2. This Opinion so unhappily miscarrying, the Jesuits substituted another, not less Treasonable and Pernicious, but only as they thought less Scandalous and better Grounded than the former. And the Sum of it is, That if a lawful Prince degenerates into a Tyrant, the Nobles and the People by the Authority residing in them, may lawfully Depose him, and chuse another to succeed him; and this Rebellious Doctrine they ground upon such Maxims as these, That all Monarchical Government was originally founded upon mutual Compacts between King and People; That if a Prince by Tyranny violate his Part of the Compact, the People are not obliged to theirs. The Princes are only Trustees for the People; that the People have still a right to resume the Power they entrusted

* *Bellarmin. de Laicis lib. 3. c. 6.*
Pender à consensu Multitudinis Constituere super se Regem vel Consules, vel alios Magistratus, ut patet; & si Causa legitima addit, potest Multitudo mutare Regnum in Aristocratiam aut Democratiam, & è contrario.

them with; and to sum up all in the Words of * *Bellarmin*, (the grand Abettor of all Republican and Deposing Principles) That 'tis the Consent of the People that Constitutes Kings or Consuls, or other Magistrates over them; and that if there be Lawful Cause, the Multitude may change the Kingdom into an Aristocracy or Democracy, and so on the contrary. 'Tis needless to aggravate the Villany of this Doctrine; the very mentioning of it, must necessarily inspire all the Lovers of Peace and Loyalty, with the greatest degree of Rage and Abhorrence against such impious Dogmatisers and Subverters of all Order and Government in the World. Yet the Books which have broach'd and maintain'd these fundamental Articles of Rebellion, were written by the most Celebrated Authors of this Loyal Society; and are still those which they most value, admire, and commend to their Disciples. 'Twould swell this Paper too much to stuff it up with numerous Quotations to this purpose. In short, they seem to be unanimous in asserting this Doctrine; and I know not whether any one Jesuit can be produc'd, that has *bona fide* gainsaid or deni'd it.

3. But thirdly, to make sure work at last, there is not any Article of Faith, in which they are more universally agreed, than they are in this; That the Pope is invested with a Power of deposing Tyrants, especially in the Case of Heresy and Persecution against Catholicks. This they think themselves obliged to believe with a Divine Faith, as having the Stamp and Signature of an Article of Faith upon it, *viz.* the Declaration of

of the Church, which they esteem the formal Reason of Faith, and into which they ultimately resolve it. Hence it is, that for Instance, † *Lessius*, ‖ *Suarez*, and ∴ *Santarellus*, do all agree in urging this Argument for it, That the Deposing Power is grounded upon the Decrees of General Councils, and universal Tradition; and that therefore, if it be unlawful, General Councils, Tradition, and the whole Catholick Church have erred; and consequently, that this Doctrine is as certain as it is, That the Church cannot err, and that the Gates of Hell shall never prevail against it; and in short, that to believe the contrary, is down-right Heresy, and an Error as dangerous to the Church, as the denial of any other Article of the Christian Religion. At this rate is it that they scrue up their Doctrine, till they make the Christian Faith, and Church, and even the veracity of Jesus Christ himself, to stand and fall with it; As if his Promises could not be verified, unless the Pope have all the Kingdoms of the World given unto him, and be set over the Nations to Build, and to Plant, and to Root out, to pull down, and to Destroy; and so close does this Doctrine sit upon the Jesuit, that he cannot part with it, even when he is vindicating the Loyalty of his Order. Thus *Eudæmon* affirms it to be the Doctrine of the whole Catholick Church, and takes pains to prove it out of *Bellarmin*, and his own Apology for *Garnet*; and so having establish'd in the Pope a judicial Power over Princes, he at last desires them not to be offended, nor to think it any Disparagement to them, * *If when the Necessity of the Church require it, they are brought as Criminals to the Bar, before such Judges as his Holiness appoints them.*

It is here further to be observ'd, That besides these three Opinions, I have now laid down, there have not been wanting some great men of that Order, that have insinuated it to be lawful for a private Person to kill a Tyrant in the Defence of his Life against him. *Becanus* delivers his Opinion in this Point somewhat scrupulously: *Subiects*, says he, *ought to obey a Tyrant by Administration, and not to kill him, unless perhaps for the necessary Defence of their Lives; but Sebi. Prif-*

† *Lessius*, *Discussio Decreti Conc. Lateran.* p. 89.

‖ *Suarez*, *De-fensio fidei*, l. 3. c. 23. sect. 16. ∴ *Santarellus*, *Tractat. de hæc.* p. 296,

* *Neque reges exui jure suo se credant si iudicibus quos ille constituit, cum id Ecclesiæ necessitas exigit, rei si stantur, p. 59.*

Apud Eudæm. p. 22. Subditi debent Tyranno ratione Administrationis obtemperare & non interficere, nisi forte ob necessariam Vitæ defensionem.

Ibidem 23. Ego sane meliorum plurimum hunc sensum esse teneo, neminem privatum extra necessitatem se suosque defendendi manus inferre posse legitimo Principi ante publicam judicialiter latam sententiam qua Tyrannus hostisque reipub. declaratur.

save only when he is under a necessity of defending himself. Lessius, Molinus, and Suarez, might be here added; but what is already alledged is sufficient to prove that this Opinion is taught by the Jesuits. It is also to be noted, that those among them who reject Mariana's Opinion, and yet assert the lawfulness of deposing a Tyrannical Prince by a publick definitive Sentence, either of the Pope or States; do yet by consequence allow it lawful for a private Person to destroy him; this is generally insinuated plainly enough by those, who affirm it unlawful for a private Man to kill a Tyrant before publick Sentence. Whence it evidently follows, that after such a Sentence it is lawful to do it; || for as Parsons, our English Jesuit, long since argued, A condemned Tyrant may lawfully be slain by a private Man authoriz'd to do it; for then he is no longer to be considered as a private Man, because he doth it by publick Authority of the Commonwealth, as doth the Executioner that cutteth off a Nobleman's head by Order and Authority of the publick Magistrate. And if this Reason be not sufficient to settle an Assassins Judgment, † Suarez,

|| Foulis p.
101.

† Suarez Defensio fidei, l. 6. c. 4. Sect. 14. 18.

Tyrannus ratione Administrationis non potest à privatis interimi quamdiu manet Princeps. Lessius de Just. lib. 2. c. 9. dub. 4. Sect. 10, & 12. Adde si tantum excrescat Tyrannis ut non amplius videatur tolerabilis, nec ullum aliud remedium superfit, primum à Rep, vel comitiis Regni, vel alio habente Autoritatem esse deponendum, & hostem Declarandum, ut in ipsius personam liceat quicquid attentare, tum enim definit esse princeps.

sius is not so modest: I, says he, hold this to be the Opinion of the more, and the better, That no private Person may lay hands upon a lawful Prince, before a publick Sentence judicially pronounc'd, whereby he is declared a Tyrant, and an Enemy to the Commonwealth,

and : Lessius will furnish him with another, in which he cannot but acquiesce; That the Pope or States when they depose a Tyrant, degrade him from being a King, and therefore after that Deposition he has no true Title to the Crown, but becomes an Usurper, and by consequence may be slain by any private Man: That it is not indeed lawful to Assassinate a Tyrant, as long as he remains a lawful Prince; but when he is deposed, he is no longer to be look'd upon under that Character, and then it may be lawful to attempt any

upon under that Character, and then it may be lawful to attempt any

any thing against his Person, because he ceases to be a Prince. So that after all this subtilizing and refining upon the Principles of Rebellion, the difference between *Mariana's* Doctrine, and that of the other Jesuits, amounts, at last, only to this; That *Mariana* pronounces it lawful for a private Man to slay a Prince when the Voice of the People, and the concurring Suffrage of the Learned declare him a Tyrant, without staying for the formality of a publick Sentence, which is to be presum'd, where it cannot well be procur'd; whereas the greatest part of his Order require first a publick definitive Sentence to depose him, and then authorize any one to be his Executioner. The former is for murdering Princes, as *Henry the 4th of France* was murdered by the hands of private Assassins, without an antecedent Sentence. The others are for arraigning and condemning them by a Court of Justice, and a solemn Pageantry of Law, as *K. Charles the Martyr* was, and then executing them by authorized and consecrated Villains.

And thus we have the whole extent of the Jesuitical Doctrine, concerning the Killing of Kings, which at the first view appears so horrid and impious, that it is not capable of any Aggravation. And it would be one of the most unaccountable things in the World, that a Religious Order of Men, who pretend to the greatest degree of Christian Perfection, and that would be esteemed the peculiar Followers of the blessed Jesus, should yet be the Preachers of such Unchristian Opinions and Doctrines of Devils: But that we have been long since forewarn'd, that Satan himself is sometimes transform'd into an Angel of Light. And the experience of all Ages assures us, that such Pretenders to extraordinary Sanctity, have been ever the fittest Instruments of Treason and Rebellion. And lastly, it is not to be wondred at, that a Society of Men, wise enough in their Generation, should suit their Principles to their Designs, and become the Teachers of such Doctrines as apparently tend to the attaining that end for which their Order was design'd, (*viz.*) The advancement of the Papal Monarchy, and the exalting it above all the Kingdoms and Governments of the World.

But notwithstanding these execrable Opinions have been publish'd and avow'd to all the World by the greatest Men of

A Vindication of Anti-Cotton,

their Order: Yet, whenever it has been their Interest to be thought of otherwise, and Apologies for their Loyalty were necessary to be written; they have never failed to set a good face upon the matter, and endeavour'd to reconcile Christ and *Belial*, Light and Darknes together. And tho these forc'd Apologies have serv'd only to shew, how impossible it is for a Jesuit to vindicate the Loyalty of his Doctrine; yet Face and Confidence, Artifice and Insinuation, have usually supplied the want of Reason and Argument, and so the Teachers of King-killing Doctrines, have at last past for Men of Loyal Principles, and been receiv'd into the Bosoms of Princes, whose Throats they have exposed to the Butchery of every bloody Zealot.

But how little the Jesuits have to say for themselves, we have now a pregnant Instance before us. The Author of *Anti-Cotton* has here charg'd them with teaching the lawfulness of killing and deposing Kings, and selected some Passages out of their approved Authors to make good the Accusation. Let us therefore now proceed to examine, how his Answerers defend their Order, and what Pleas they offer in Vindication of it, and then I doubt not but it will appear how indefensible a Cause they had undertaken.

Eudamon, p. 11, 12. Nego non modo in reges moderatos & æquos, sed ne in eos quidem qui in regno quod jure obtinent tyrannice tamen dominantur, quamvis infideles, hæreticos, persecutores Ecclesie, etiam religionis causâ privato cuiquam à Jesuitis jus ullum tribui.

I. Then to the Charge it self, it is replied, That the Jesuits do not teach it lawful for a private Man to Kill a lawful Prince, tho never so great a Tyrant, Hæretick, or Persecutor of the Church, under Colour of Religion. So *Eudamon* expressly, and to the same purpose the Agologist.

But how insufficient this Plea is, a few brief Reflections on it will abundantly evince. For

1. What they affirm in general, that no such Power is attributed by Jesuits to any private Person, is notoriously false, as appears from what has been already said concerning the Opinion of *Mariana*, and its being approved by divers others of their Order.

2. Granting what they affirm to be true; this plea discharges them only from the guilt of the first opinion, and leaves the

the imputation of the other opinions in its full force against them; and therefore the disclaiming of that first opinion will not do their business; for that is only a Branch of *Anti-Cotton's* Accusation; and what he charges upon them in general, That under the Cloak and Colour of Religion, and when they judge it necessary for the good of the Church, they think it Lawful to Depose and make away Princes, will be sufficiently made good, if it can be proved that (suppose they don't allow private persons, as such, to do it) they do yet Ascribe to the Pope, to Subordinate Magistrates, or to the whole body of the People, a power of Deposing Princes by publick Sentence, and then of putting it in Execution against them. And accordingly it is further to be observed,

3. That by a private person here, they only mean such an one, as is not Commission'd to perform the Execution, but attempts it out of some private Impulse of his own, without any publick Warrant and Authority to justify him in it; and therefore still it is owned, that a private person may lawfully execute a condemned Tyrant; and this the Answerers are so far from denying, that they both of them alledg divers of their Authors that expressly own it. It will be sufficient, to give two or three instances of this. The words of *Em. Sat.*

refer'd to by *Eudæmon* || speaks plainly enough to this purpose. *A Lawful Prince, says he, that Governs Tyrannically, cannot be Depriv'd without publick judgment; but when Sentence is pronounced, any one may be the Executioner of it.* And

so also Cardinal *† Tolet* is produced, affirming that it is not *† Ibid.* lawful to kill a Tyrant by Administration, without publick Authority; and *Jac. Gresler* ||; That it is the more common opinion, that it is never Lawful to lay hands upon a Prince

transform'd into a Tyrant, before publick and authoritative Judgment be Pronounc'd against him, whereby he is declared an enemy to the Republick, and so deprived of his Kingdom by those that have a right to do it. There are many other of their * Authors cited by *Eudæmon* and the Apologist, which in effect do unanimously assert the same thing, and which *Father Cotton* had before urged in his Declaratory Letter, to

|| P. 18. Tyrannice Gubernans Juste ac quæritur dominium non potest Spoliari sine publico judicio, liti vero sententia potest quisq; fieri Executor.

* Molina. Delrio. Salmeron. Azorius. Valentia Lessius; Heissius. Richeomus. Becanus. Serarius.

A Vindication of Anti-Cotton,

shew that the Jesuits did not hold it Lawful to Murder a Prince^o that abus'd his Power unto Tyranny. And such are the Testimonies which these Jesuits, and after them some others of their Order, have appeal'd to, for the Vindication of their Doctrine: tho there can be nothing plainer, than that they all hold it Lawful, first to Depose a Prince who shall be judged a Tyrant, and then after Sentence to Assassinate and Destroy him; and to shew what an admirable Apology this is for their Loyalty, I shall reduce it into the form of an Address to a Prince that suspects them.

'Tho our Enemies have Maliciously Represented us as Men
'of Treasonable Principles, that hold it Lawful to Depose and
'Murder the Anointed of the Lord; we yet beseech You not
'to give Credit to their Calumnies. Far be it from us to have
'the least thoughts of broaching and maintaining such an
'Hellish Principle. We have on the contrary (excepting only
'some few of our Order) unanimously maintained that it is an
'unwarrantable presumption for any private person to embroe
'his hands in the Blood of Kings, before they be Condemned

Scimus non justam modo causam cedis,
sed legitimam etiam Protestatem requiri ut
quis jure occidatur: Neq; deterioris condi-
tionis principes jure omnium gentium sacro
sanctos quam latrones aut sicarios facimus,
in quos quamvis extrema omnia meritos,
privatis tamen nullum jus facimus. Eudæ.
p. 33.

'by those that have Authority to do
'it. *We know and constantly teach,*
'that not only a just cause, but also
'a lawful Power is required to justify
'the Execution of the meanest person;
'and far be it from you to think that
'we put Princes (whose Persons have
'been by all Nations esteemed sacred)
'into a worse condition than even Thieves and Murderers, whom we
'allow not private men to Execute. True it is, we have constantly
'taught, that a Prince may by his Holiness, or by his own Sub-
'jects be Lawfully Deposed. But still we affirm, that it is not
'our Doctrine that they may be kill'd before Sentence is pass'd
'against them. And then soasmuch as he ceases to be a Prince,
'it is only a private and common Malefactor, and not the sacred
'person of a Prince, that we expose to slaughter. And there-
'fore since neither our Doctrine nor our Practice can justly be
'stained with the imputation of Disloyalty; we doubt not but
'You will Extend Your Favour and Bounty towards us: which
'if You shall do, and the Pope not command the contrary, we
'shall

' shall demean our selves as becomes those who desire to be esteemed Your most Loyal and Obedient Subjects. This is an exact Transcript of the Jesuits Apology for themselves, and let every one judg how well it acquits them.

II. But that I may not seem to omit any thing which the Answerers of *Anti-Cotton* have thought fit to Reply, and which deserves to be Considered; I proceed to Examine the objections against those few passages which the Author of this Treatise had Collected out of their Books, to justify his charge against them. And because these objections for the most part consist only of some little cavils and trifling exceptions, and so are of no great consequence as to the main design of our Author; I shall here propose only some few of them, reserving others to be considered under the head of particular Doctrines. And

First, To that passage of *Ribadeneira* urged by *Anti-Cotton*, as approving the Parricide of *James Clement*, *Eudamon* and the Apologist do both object, that the words do not imply an approbation of the fact; because it is certain when any Prince, especially a wicked one, is Murdered, it is to be look'd upon as a just judgment of God upon him, tho the person that commits the Murder is nevertheless to be esteemed an execrable Villain for it. This gloss seems plausible enough; but if we take all together it will not excuse him. 'Tis evident that the crime for which the Jesuits ascribe the Murder of that King to the just Judgment of God, was his not heartily endeavouring to destroy the *Hugonots*, and not joyning with the Holy League to extirpate Heresie. And this we know is with them a sufficient cause to Legitimate the Deposing and Murthering a Prince; and therefore the most natural meaning of such words, when they come from a Jesuit, is, that he was justly Murder'd by the hands of a simple young Monk set on by the judgment of God. And this Sence is most agreeable to the whole Speech of *Sixtus* the 5th, in which he Magnifies the Heroick Exploit of this simple Fryar, beyond those of *Eleazer* and *Judith*, and frequently ascribes it to the particular providence and disposition of Almighty God. And so also to *Bel-larmin's* Commendation of this Assassin, who calls him *Sacratum Virum*, and affirms, *That God avenged his anointed the Pope,*
when.

Utrius est deus Christum suum dum per
 alium sacratum Vtrum regem ~~vindictam~~ non
 sine manibus, diuine providentie miraculo
 interfecit. Bellarm. Tom. 7. Resp. ad Apo-
 log pro jur fid. p. 671.

when by him he miraculously destroy-
 ed that King, not without the peculiar
 assistance of the Divine Providence.
 But to be short, if any one now should
 affirm, that King Charles the Martyr,

because he did not endeavour with all his might to Extirpate
 Popery; was by the just Judgment of God Condemn'd by a
 Court of Justice, and then died upon a Scaffold; I appeal to
 any one, whether such words would not be liable to be Inter-
 preted as a manifest approbation of that execrable Murder?

To those passages out of the *Ambitheatre of Honour*, compil'd
 by *Scribanius*, disguising himself under the feign'd Name of
Clayus Bonarscius, they both reply, that it cannot be prov'd, that
Scribanius was the Author of it, and therefore they are not
 bound to account for him. * But *Ribadensira* in his Catalogue
 of the Writers of their Society, printed but a Year before,
 Ascribes that Book to *Scribanius*, and commends him for it:
 So that here we have a Specimen of the Sincerity of the
 Jesuits; they can freely own an Author, when it is for the
 Credit of the Society; and then confidently renounce him,
 when they dare not defend him. But here these Jesuits had
 Father Cottons example to Justify him, who (when the Kings
 Advocate shewed to Henry the 4th the places in this *Ambitheatre*
 of Honour which encouraged the Murdering of Princes)
 replied, That the Book was Printed at Geneva, and Father'd
 upon the Jesuits, to render the Society odious. And yet after-
 wards (as the said Advocate relates) openly commended *Scri-*
banias as the Author of it, distributed many Copies, and extol'd
 it as a Book of singular Profit to those who Learned the Latin
 Tongue.

To the Quotation out of *Bellarmin*, *Eudemon* does not deny
 the Popes Sovereign Power of disposing Kingdoms, to be the
 opinion of *Bellarmin* and all the Jesuits, but only cavils at
 omitting the words immediately following (if it be necessary
 for the Salvation of Souls) which, says he, would have prevent-
 ed all objections against that Doctrine, and shew'd upon what
 solid grounds they maintain it. And so also to that which fol-
 lows out of *Gresler*, he only blames him for suppressing those
 words of *Gresler*, If the Prince Rules Tyrannically, and extirpates
 the

Vid Ep. Ca-
 faub ad Front.
 p. 23. & de-
 inceps.

* Catalogus
 Script. Soc.
 Jesu. p. 38.

Hospinian
 Hist. Jesuit.
 p. 133. & 134.

the true Religion; which, says he, would have convinced all Men of the necessity of deposing him. So that according to this Author, If a Prince goes about to extirpate Popery, 'tis as clear as the Sun, that he may and must be depos'd; nay, according to the Lateran Council, he incurs the same Punishment, if he does not extirpate Heresy. What follows in *Eudemus*, is no less plain and ingenuous.

Now, says he, in that you reprehend Gresser for saying, that if the Pope use his Deposing Power discreetly and wisely, it is a meritorious Work: This is downright Madness; for all his Power being given to the Pope for Edification, he does then discreetly use it, when the exercise of it promotes the Edification of the Church. And who can doubt that believes any Work to be meritorious, that those acts which are done by the Pastor of the Church for the benefit of it, are truly such?

To the Passage of *Tolæ*, *Eudemon* replies, 1. That the word *Syhdiis* is not in *Folet*; 'tis true, it is not; but *Anti Cotton* here does not cite the Words, but the * Sense and Doctrine of *Tolæ*, which he has faithfully done, as appears from his citing immediately after the famous Canon of *Nos Sanctorum*, which absolves Subjects from their Oaths of Allegiance to excommunicate Princes. 2. He adds, That the Subject is indeed freed from the Obligation of his Oath to an excommunicated Prince, but not from that of natural Allegiance; as if the Obligation of natural Fealty were more Sacred and Inviolable, than that of a Religious Oath; and he that assumes the Power of dissolving the one, had not as much right to dispence with the other. To the other Quotation out of the same Author, That a Person excommunicated cannot exercise an Act of Jurisdiction, The Apologist blames our Author for leaving out *alique*

Eudemus p. 93. Jam quod reprehendis dictum à Gressero. Si jure suo prudenter & circumspectè Pontifex utatur, opus esse meritorium planè desinas. Cum enim potestatem omnem suam in ædificationem acceperit à Christo, tunc prudenter circumspectè quæcquid utitur; cum juris ejus usurpatio facit ad ædificationem Ecclesiæ. Cui autem dudum esse potest, qui ullum modo opus meritorium agnoscat, quæ a Pastorebus sunt in bonum Ecclesiæ ea meritoria esse?

Tolæ *ibid*, Sect. 3. Excommunicatus non potest coercere actum jurisdictionis absque peccato, immo si publica est Excommunicatio facta, sententiæ nullæ sunt.

peccato, which is joyned to it; and hence he infers, that it is *Tolæ's* Opinion, That it is only a Sin for a Person excommunicate, to exercise Jurisdiction; but that still his Acts are to all purposes.

* *Tolæ* *imo* 1. *instruc. Sacer.* c. 13. Sect. 7. Qui tenebantur alias obnoxii Sacramento fidelitatis vel juramenti liberantur a vinculo si incederit in Excommunicationem.

purposes valid. But the very next Words of the Cardinal, affirm the contrary. For if, says he, the Excommunication be made publick, his judicial Acts are null.

These are the most material Objections, which they urge against the Citations of *Anti-Cotton*: I shall only further take notice of what they say to those two Books, which are but just mention'd by *Anti-Cotton*. The first is that famous Pamphlet, *De justa abdicatione, Hen. 3.* published immediately after the Murder of that Prince, in which all the Principles of Treason are dogmatically maintain'd, the Rebellion of the Holy League justified, and the Parricide of *Jacques Clement* applauded. 'Tis true, (as the Answerers reply) the Author of this detestable Book was no Jesuit; but was afterward known to be one *Jean Boucher*, a Sorbon Doctor, and Curat of *Paris*; neither does *Anti-Cotton* affirm him to be of that Society; but only suspects it came out of their Forge, because it was printed at *Lyons*, where the Jesuits were in a manner absolute, and had the known and usual Mark of their Society upon it. And besides the Book it self contains in it nothing but what is exactly agreeable to the Maxims of the Jesuits, and the Positions of the most celebrated Writers of their Order. And the Author himself, tho no Jesuit, had yet some Relation to them, as having had his Education in the Colledge of *Clermont*, where he was first poisoned by those Doctors of Rebellion; and afterwards (which was a known Practice of the Jesuits) transplanted into the University to propagate the same Sanguinary Divinity among the Members of that Body also.

Foulis p. 72,
and 102.

The other is *Franciscus Verona*, who writ an Apology to justify the attempt of *John Chastel* upon *Henry 4.* him also the Answerers deny to be a Jesuit, neither has *Anti-Cotton* any where affirm'd it. I shall only set down what Mr. *Foulis* has observed concerning him, That about the same time there was a French Jesuit of the same Name, who afterwards writ some Books against the Protestants, but whether they were both the same Person, he cannot determine. Yet *Sanderfon*, he says, in his History of King *James the 6th*, does positively affirm that he was a Jesuit. He observes also, that the same year (*viz.*) 1595. that this Book was printed, one *Le Bell*, a Jesuit, was punished for endeavouring to convey one *Fran. Zois Veron*, a Student of

Poitiers,

Poissiers, out of France which is also related by *Anti-Cotton*. But let them, if they please, affirm, that those are no more but slight Presumptions, which can prove nothing. Our Evidence against them, does not depend upon these two Authors. And allowing that they are not concern'd in them, the most they can make out, is, That the Jesuits were not the Authors of two the most impious Books that ever were written, tho they speak nothing but the Sense of their own approved Authors.

III. Another method which *Eudæmon* takes to vindicate his Order from the Charge advanced against them, is to appeal to divers publick Testimonies, which had been given of the Loyalty of their Principles; and the first he produces, is *Pelletarius*, an Author of whom we find this Character in *Thuanus*, That he was first a Soldier, and then a mercenary Writer, that observed no bounds, either in calumniating his Adversaries, or extolling his Friends; in a word, that he was a great Bigot for the Jesuits; and therefore it is not to be wonder'd if such an Author should give a favourable Character of them. And yet the Substance of what he says in their behalf, is only, That there is no harm in their Doctrine, as *Richeom* in his Apology had represented it. This *Richeom* was himself a Jesuit; and during the time of their Banishment out of France, wrote an Apology for their Order; and 'twould have been very hard if a Jesuit could not have said something for his Society, nor have lick'd over their monstrous Doctrines into some shape of Loyalty.

Thuan. contin. lib. 5. p. 258.

But that which they urge with the greatest Confidence, is the Speech of *Henry 4.* in Answer to an humble Remonstrance made to him by the Assessors of the Parliament of *Paris* against the Restitution of the Jesuits. In this Speech, there is a very honourable Character given of their Order; their Industry, Learning and Piety, are highly commended, the common Objections against them answer'd; their Behaviour in the Holy League, their Vow of Obedience to the Pope, and adhering to the Interest of *Spain* excus'd; and their Doctrines concerning killing Kings, and exempting the Clergy from Obedience to them, absolutely deni'd. But the Credit of this Testimony will be lost, if we consider, 1. That *Anno 1604.* when this

Ibid. lib. 4. p. 203.

A Vindication of Anti-Cotton,

Speech is pretended to be made, the King then was become their Friend, and was resolved by all means to be reconcil'd to that ingrateful Society, that so he might free himself from the fears he was always in, of being assassinated by them; and therefore, ever after, he was their great Advocate and Patron,

Ibid. l. 3. p. 97. Solitus erat dicere se quotidie inaurare eos quos sibi maximè infensos expertus esset, ut auro suæ bonitatis malitiæ eorum plumbum corrigeret.

and continually heaped new Favours upon them; It being an usual saying of his, *That he daily obliged those whom he had experienced to be his most inveterate Enemies, that so by his goodness*

Ibid. p. 202.

to them, he might extirpate their malice against him. And much

Ibid. 210.

less will it be for their Credit, when it appears, 2^{dly}, That this is only a sham Speech impudently forg'd and published by the Jesuits under the King's Name. So *Thuanus*, 'tis plain, accounted it; for after he has at large set down the true Remonstrance of the Senate; he adds, that the Jesuits Friends published another Summary of an Oration, made against the Jesuits, *Quam ipsi confixerant*, which themselves had forged, together with the King's Answer to it. So also *Martilier*, Advocate of the University of Paris, in his Pleas against the Jesuits, directly charges them before the Parliament with the Forgery of this Supposititious Speech, which he says, *That to impose upon Forreigners, they also published in the Latin and Italian Tongues, and that Gretser had translated it into German, and Possevin had inserted it in his Bibliotheca, that a Monument of this imposture might be transmitted unto Posterity also.* And so manifest was this Forgery, that *Montbolone* the Advocate of the Jesuits, had nothing to say to it, in his long Answer to the Speech of *Martilier*; tho he omits almost nothing else that had been urg'd against them. And yet after this publick Conviction of the Cheat, the Jesuits (with a modesty peculiar to that Order) have not been asham'd to appeal frequently to this Speech, as an irrefragable Testimony of the Innocence and Loyalty of their Society.

IV. But lastly, That which the Answerer seems most to Triumph in, as the clearest and most unexceptionable Vindication of themselves, is the known Decree of *Claudius Aquavivus* their General, made in the year 1610. *Wherein he strictly charges*

charges all the Members of his Society, by Virtue of that Holy Obedience they had vow'd unto him, That thenceforth none of them should presume either in their publick or private Lectures, or Advices; and much less in the Books they should write, to affirm, That it

was lawful for any Person under any pretext of Tyranny whatsoever, to kill Kings or Princes, or to contrive their Death. And then he warns all the Provincials to take care, That this Decree be religiously observed under Pain of being depriv'd of their Offices. This is the Substance of that Decree; and how little it will serve to vindicate the Society from the Doctrines imputed to them, will, I hope, appear from what follows. 1. It is to be observed, That the Decree does not pretend to condemn the Doctrine of King-killing it self, as impious and unlawful, but only prohibits the maintaining it, either in their Books, Lectures or Discourses. There were many of those Authors, who have positively asserted the lawfulness of deposing and destroying Kings degenerated into Tyrants, which had been Licensed by Aquaviva himself; and it is not to be imagined, that he designed to condemn a Doctrine, which he himself, and his Society were engaged to maintain. But he saw, that their Enemies in France made great Advantage of it, to the Prejudice of their Interest there, and that Destruction was in a manner hanging over the head of his Order for it; and therefore it was thought best to accommodate themselves to the present Exigency, and for some time to Silence a Doctrine that had almost ruin'd them: And so the utmost that can be made of this silencing Decree is, That they had so much Wit, as not to maintain a Doctrine, when their Brains were in danger for it. But 2. it is not improbable that the Doctrine of Mariana is here only intended to be silenc'd, That it is lawful for a private Person to kill a Tyrant before judicial Sentence. 'Tis evident, that the words may be interpreted, so as to imply no more. For *cuiusque personæ*, cannot comprehend more than *nulli particulari*; now Gregory de Valentia tells us, That 'tis not lawful for any particular man (which is all one, as any Person whatsoever in the Decree)

Eudamon p. 39. Ne quis deinceps nostræ Societatis publicè aut privatim prælegendo seu consulendo, multo etiam minus libros conscribendo affirmare præsumat licitum esse cuicumque personæ quocunque prætextu Tyrannidis Reges aut Principes occidere, &c.

particulari licet eum occidere, nam eum tunc coercere pertinet ad remp. quæ posset jure oppugnare illum, & vocare in subsidium cives.

Valentia Tom. 3. disp. 5. q. 8. punct. 3. Nulli

Thuan. cont.
lib. 5. p. 315.

to kill a Tyrant; but then he adds, for that belongs to the Republick, who have a right to Destroy him, and call all their Members to assist them. So that the Words of this Prohibition do in effect say no more, than that Author (who was Licen'd by Gregory 14.) has done, That it is not lawful for any private Person to destroy a Tyrant. And this will be the more confirm'd when it is added, 3. That notwithstanding this Decree, the Jesuits still continued to compile and publish Books that dogmatically maintained the Doctrine of deposing and killing Princes, by publick Authority. It was hardly two years since this Declaration was made, when the Book of *Becanus* the Jesuit, entituled, *Controversia Anglicana de potentia, Regis & Papæ*, was printed with Allowance at Ments. Out of this Book, a Doctor of the Sorbon collected eleven Propositions, in which all the Treasonable Principles of the Jesuits are asserted; That the Pope can Excommunicate and Depose Kings, and absolve their Subjects from all Obligation of Duty and Obedience to them. That the High Priest in the *Old Testament*, could in some Cases punish Kings with Death; and that the Pope had, at least, as great a Power now under the Gospel. That all Princes that violate the Privileges of Monasteries, were to be Deposed. That Emperors and Kings are placed as Dogs, to watch over the Flock of Christ; and if they prove Sluggish, or worry the Flock, the Pope, who is constituted Supreme Pastor of it, must remove them. And that, lastly, all Monarchies are founded upon a mutual Stipulation between Prince and People, whose Power is also so great, that they can exclude the Lawful Heir, and Elect another. We must remember, that those Maxims were fram'd with a particular aim at this Kingdom, and calculated for the Deposing our Kings as Hereticks, and substituting good Catholics in their room; and tho the Pope by the earnest Intercessions of *France*, was obliged to Censure this Book; yet he does not condemn it as impious and heretical, but only as containing many things false, temerarious, scandalous, and respectively seditious; without specifying what those things are, and so in effect condemning nothing at all, but leaving every one at Liberty of maintaining any of the Doctrines contained in it.

And

And so little regard was had to this Illusory Decree, that two Years after that, viz. An. 1614, it was again dispensed with for the sake of so great a man as *Suarez*; who then Published at *Cologne* his ‡ Defence of the Catholick and Apostolical Faith, (that is, the Power of Deposing Kings, &c.) against the Errors of the *English*, Sect. 1. And that it may appear, how constantly the Jesuits have adhered to their Beloved Doctrine of Rebellion, it may not be superfluous to give a brief account of some of the positions of this so much admired Author, whom the Jesuits value as the greatest Ornament and Glory of their Order, and would rather expose twenty Kings to Slaughter, than lose the credit of him.

‡ Defensio fidei Catholicæ & Apostolicæ adversus Anglicanæ sectæ errores. p. 25.

To give an exact account of all the Treasonable Contents of this Book, it would be necessary to Transcribe one half of it; it will therefore suffice to observe some of the most remarkable passages in him. In his third Book he endeavours at large to Establish the Catholick Supremacy of the Pope; and at length, Cap. 22. undertakes to prove, That all Christian Kings are his Subjects as well as other Christians; That by Virtue of that Power, the Pope hath a Civil Jurisdiction over their Kingdoms; can correct or revoke all Laws that he shall judge contrary to good manners, §. 10. Or to any part of the Canon-Law, §. 11. (So that all Laws Indulging Liberty of Conscience, or made for the preservation of the Protestant Religion, are hereby revokable at the pleasure of the Pope, because contrary to those Canons that Decree the Extirpating of Heresie.) That he has an indirect Power of altering Laws that are purely Civil, if they give occasion to Sin, §. 12. And can Annul all Laws made by the Civil Powers concerning matters Ecclesiastical, tho such Laws are in themselves Null, because without the Sphere of Civil Jurisdiction, and so Enacted by an incompetent Authority, §. 13. That he can likewise rescind all unjust Sentences of Courts of Judicature, and call any Temporal Cause to himself, when 'tis in a case necessary to any Spiritual ends, §. 14. And that lastly, he has a right, when he thinks it necessary, to command Princes to become the Executioners of his Will and Pleasure. And Cap. 23. not content with all this, he gives him also a Coërcive Power over Kings that are wicked and incorrigible,

ble, especially pertinacious Hereticks and Schismaticks; because a Directive Power without a Coactive, would signify nothing: And this Power he does not confine to Ecclesiastical Censures, but maintains that it may be also extended to the inflicting Temporal Penalties, and even deprivation of their Kingdoms; and this he proves, first, From *Pasce Oves*, and *Quodcumque Ligaveris*, §. 10, 11. From St. Peter's Killing *Ananias*, §. 12: And St. Paul's delivering that incestuous person to Satan, for the destruction of the flesh, §. 13. 2ly, He confirms it by the authority and practice of the Church, and the Decrees of the General Councils of *Lions*, and the *Lateran*, under *Innocent* the 3d. and thence concludes, That 'tis as certain as the Inerrability of the Church it self, §. 14, 15, 16. And 3dly, He proves it by Reasons taken from the Absolute Necessity of such a Power in the Supreme Pastor of the Church, both in respect of Emperors and Kings themselves, and of the People subject to them, §. 17. And this is the substance of his Doctrine concerning the Popes Directive, Coactive, and Vindictive Power over Kings. But in his 6th Book, wherein he pretends to Confute King *James's* Apology for the Oath of Allegiance, he does more particularly set himself to explicate and maintain in a Scholastick manner, the whole Doctrine of the Jesuits concerning the Deposing and Murdering of Kings, Cap. 2. He Affirms, That those Propositions implied in the Oath, that the Pope has not a power of Deposing Princes, and of Absolving their Subjects from their Allegiance, are erroneous, and contrary to Faith. And consequently, Cap. 3. That it is erroneous also to Affirm, That Subjects are bound to pay true Faith and Obedience to a Prince Deposed by the Pope. And then Cap. 4. in his Examination of that part of the Oath, wherein the Doctrine of Deposing and Murdering Princes is abjured as Impious and Heretical, he states the question about killing Lawful Kings that govern Tyrannically.

First then, He tells us, That among Christians, a Prince that draws his Subjects into Heresie or Schism, is to be reckoned as one of the first rank of Tyrants, §. 1. Then he lays down this position, §. 2. That such a Prince cannot Lawfully be Slain by any private person; but this Assertion he after qualifies and abates by declaring, §. 5. That a private man has
by

by the Law of Nature a Right to Defend his Life against a Prince that Assaults him, tho the Death of the Prince ensue upon it. And so also, §. 6. If a King does by force of Arms endeavour to Destroy a City, any private man in the Defence of the Community may then resist and Kill him. §. 14. He proceeds to Dispute whether a Lawful Prince may be killed by a private person after Sentence pronounced against him, which Assertion he there affirms may be founded on the Decree of the Council of *Constance*, which forbids private men to kill Tyrants, *Non expectatâ Sententiâ vel Mandato judicis Cujuscunque*; and upon this Reason also, that the Aggressor does not then act upon private Authority, but in virtue of a publick Sentence; and that moreover, after Sentence is pronounced, he is no longer a Lawful King; and if he then retains the Kingdom by force, he Commences a Tyrant by Title, and may therefore be dealt with as such, and consequently be Killed by any private person whatsoever. This he propounds as a difficulty to be examined, and for the resolution of it, §. 15. He lays down this as unquestionable, That a Sovereign Prince may by publick Sentence be Deposed; and so enquires, with whom this Power is lodged; which he supposes to be in the Republick, and the Pope, in different respects, in the Republick, by virtue of the right it has to defend and preserve it self; which right he supposes to be reserved by the Original compact, wherein the People transferred their Power upon the Prince. But §. 16. He says, This power is lodged in the Pope, by virtue of that Jurisdiction which he has over Kings, as subject to him. But that this Prerogative might at last be in effect appropriated to his Lord God the Pope alone, he adds, §. 17. That tho Republicks considered in themselves, and not as composed of Christians, have an Independent Power of Defending themselves against Tyrants, and Deposing them; yet that Christian Communities cannot exercise this power, but with Subordination to the Supreme Pastor of the Church; both because he has a Power of Commanding them, not to Depose their King before he has taken Cognizance of the Cause; for 'tis his Duty to take care that the Souls of Men be not exposed to ruin, by unnecessary Tumults and Rebellions; and also, because he has a right of enjoying the Republick.

Republick to Depose their King, when he judges it necessary for their spiritual good; and especially for the preventing Heresie and Schism. And so §. 18. he thus resolves the case, That after judicial sentence, they that pass it, may proceed actually to deprive the condemned Prince of his Kingdom, and may also lawfully kill him, if either the sentence extend to death, or he cannot be well deprived without it; and yet the deposed King is not immediately to be murdered by every private person, unless he be particularly commanded, or a general Commission, declared in the sentence it self, or in the Law, authorize him to it: But as to the Pope, he adds, That if he commissions none to drive a Prince, he has deposed, out of his Dominions, or else to kill him, then the right of executing the sentence, devolves upon him that is next in succession; but if there be none to claim the right of succeeding, it belongs to the Kingdom it self. But enough of this horrid and detestable Divinity, which is every where dispersed throughout this Book; what I have here collected, is sufficient to give a just Idea of this Author: But if these opinions be a part of the Catholick and Apostolick Faith, Infidelity, Heresie and Apostacy, are certainly very innocent things in comparison of it. And yet if the highest approbation can make Doctrines pass for current, as Catholick and Orthodox, this Book has a just title to be esteemed such; for it is approved by three Catholick Bishops, by a whole Catholick University, *viz.* *Alcala de Henares*, by the holy Inquisition, and the Provincial Jesuits of *Portugal* and *Germany*; and one of the Approvers does expressly affirm, that he found all things in it agreeable to the Holy Scriptures, Apostolical Traditions, General Councils, and Papal Decrees. The Jesuits to be sure thought them conformable to all these, as well as to their own Maxims, and therefore made no scruple to step over a Decree, of which they well enough knew the secret, and authorize a Book that so admirably defended the Catholick faith of their Order. I do not find that this pernicious Book was ever censured and condemned by any, but the Parliament of *Paris*, who were only a company of Laymen, and therefore not looked upon as competent Judges in those matters: But however they assumed such a power, and sentenced the Book to be burnt* by the Hangman, and prohibited the printing or selling of it; and decreed like

* Thuanus
cont. Hist. p.
410.

likewise, that *Armandus*, *Cotton*, *Frinton* and *Firmoudus* (the chief Fathers of the Society) should be summoned before them, and receive a Reprimand for suffering this Book to be printed, and brought to *Paris*, contrary to their own declaration, and their Generals decree; and that they should also be strictly enjoined to take care, that this Decree should be received and published again, and that they should more strictly look to the observation of it, otherwise they would proceed against them as guilty of High Treason, and disturbers of the publick peace; and this was the occasion of a second Decree of their General *Visselleschi*, Ann. 1616, wherein the former is ratified, and the Jesuits are forbidden to defend the lawfulness of * King-killing, either in writing or discourse. In this second Edition of their Decree, there is nothing new, it is liable to all the same objections, and it was much alike observed; I shall give two instances of this also: Anno 1625. our comes the Book of *Sanctarellus*, concerning Heresie, Schism, and Apostasy, printed at *Rome*, and after an examination of three of the Society, Licensed by *Mutius Visselleschi*, then General of the Order, and the Master of the Sacred Palace; out of this Book the Faculty at *Paris*, among divers others, extracted these Assertions, That the Pope can punish Heretical Kings with temporal punishments, and not only Excommunicate them, but also deprive them of their Dominions, and discharge their Subjects from all obedience to them; (and this he proves at large, *Cap. 30.* by ten Arguments, coincident for the most part with those of *Suarez*); and that further, the Pope can proceed against them for other crimes also, if it be expedient, and depose them likewise, if they be either negligent and useless, or insufficient and incapable of governing. So that here we have the deposing power again asserted in its utmost latitude. But notwithstanding its approbation at *Rome*, || it was condemned in *France* by the Court of Parliament at *Paris*, and the eight Universities of that Kingdom; and some of the principal Jesuits themselves pretended by subscription to condemn him also; but this did not give satisfaction; so they were enjoined to confute the Tenets of *Sanctarellus*, and write a Book against him; but this they declined, because they durst not carry on the Great, so far as to write against a Book authorized by the General.

* Ne quisquam scriptum vel sermone doceat licitum esse cuiusque personae quocunque prae-textu tyrannidis Reges occidere
† Censura facultatis Theologicæ in librum Ant. Sanctarelli.

|| Foulis. 646.
647. Alphon-
sus de Varga-
Relatio de
Stratagematis
Jesuitarum,
C. 56.

neral. For that all these professions of renouncing those Doctrines, were nothing but meer Legerdemain, is evident from their own answers to the Interrogatories of the Court of Parliament, when some of them were conven'd before them; for being asked whether they approved the Contents of that Book, as their General had done; *F. Cotton* their Provincial and Rector of *Clermont*, in the name of the rest of the Society, answered, *They did not; that their Society did indeed believe them at Rome; but that ought not to be imputed to them in France, being of another perswasion.* And being again asked, whether they did not believe as their General? he answered, *our General living at Rome, is not to be supposed to contradict what is believed there.* What do you believe then? said the Court; *the quite contrary*, says the Father; and what would you believe if you were at Rome? *We would change our minds with the Country, and believe as they did at Rome.* To which some of the Court answered, *Have these men then one conscience at Rome, and another at Paris? God keep us from such Confessors.* And this is no more than what his Predecessor had answered before, when Subscription was in the like case required of them, That their Constitutions * allowed them to observe the Rulers of the place where they lived; but that he could not undertake, that the General at Rome should subscribe also. So conveniently have the Jesuits contrived their Rules, that they can be allowed to change, and shift, and accommodate themselves to all times and places, so as to alter their opinions with the Climate, and abjure Doctrines in one Country, which they will maintain as Catholick and Apostolick in another. The other instance, I shall produce, is the Book of *F. Mabony* a Jesuit, intitled an *Apologetical Disputation concerning the right of the Kingdom of Ireland, in behalf of the Irish Catholicks, against the English Heretick.* This Book † Father *Welsh* says was printed 1645. *Permissu Superiorum*; and there cites these passages out of it, 'That supposing, not granting, that the Kings of England were (as the English falsely pretend) true and lawful Kings of Ireland; yet nevertheless the States of the Kingdom might, and ought to have deposed them, when they became Hereticks and Tyrants. And then it follows, 'For this right of deposing Tyrannical Princes, resides in every Kingdom and Republick; now if to the consent of the Kingdom, the Authority

* Thu. Hist.
Contr. p. 219.

† Vindication
of the Irish
Remonstranc.
p. 736, 737.

Authority Apostolical should be added, who-but a Heretick or a Fool will dare to deny that which I here affirm, which Divines, Canonists, and Civilians unanimously teach, which is prov'd by Reasons, and confirmed by Examples? And in his Exhortation to the *Irish* Catholicks, annexed as an Appendix to it, he presses them to renounce the Protestant Kings of *England*, and elect an *Irish* Native, that is a Catholick; and excites them also to put to death, not only the *English* and *Scotch* Hereticks in *Ireland*, but even the Catholick *Irish* also, that should continue faithful to an Heretical King. This is downright Jesuitism indeed, without equivocation, or mental reservation; but it was inconsistent even with the Oath of Association, which those infamous Rebels had made, and was therefore condemned to be burnt by the Grandees of the Rebellion, who stiled themselves the supreme Council of the *Roman* Catholick Confederates in *Ireland*; and yet this Libel was not only printed with allowance, but also industriously dispersed throughout *Ireland*, not without the knowledg of the Nuncio himself, as Father *Wells* insinuates; who also protected a Priest from Justice, in whose keeping it was found. And *Mabony* himself, who lived at *St. Roch* in *Lisbon*, did openly declare, that he was the Author of it, which he durst not have done, had not his Book been approved, and had he not known his Doctrine to be conformable to the sentiments of his Superiors, to whom he was accountable for it. I will conclude what I have here said, to invalidate their appeals to this Decree of their General, as a testimony how far they are from asserting the deposing decree, with what one of their own Religion, who thinks it was intended to oblige in *France* only, has affirmed concerning it: I * have (says he) been informed, that 'tis a known practice of your Society, that your Generals should forbid some actions, which they are not unwilling, their subjects should practice, to the end that they may reject weak men, by saying, it cannot be true, because they have a rule against it; and to more understanding parties they may excuse the fault, by laying the defect on particulars, who will not obey their commands. And thus have I at large considered the most important pleas of *Anti-Coston's* Answerers to the charge of teaching the lawfulness of deposing and murdering Princes. I proceed now to some other particular Doctrines here

* The Jesuits
Reasons un-
reasonable,
p. 69.

imputed to them, which usually follow in the Retinue of the former; were designed for its service, and exactly fitted for the more easie and convenient execution of it. And these are the exemption of the Clergy, their Doctrines of Equivocation, Confession, and blind obedience.

1. I begin with their exempting all Religious Persons from the Secular Jurisdiction; how effectually this Prerogative tends to the Advancement of the Papal See, the Establishment of an Ecclesiastick Tyranny, the Ruin of Civil Government, and the facilitating all Designs against the Persons and Crowns of Princes, is obvious and manifest to all Men. The *Romish* Clergy had for several Ages claimed this exorbitant Priviledg, and 'twas the safest way to Canonization, to dye in the Defence of it. That Passage of the *Psalmist*, *Touch not mine anointed*, the command of honouring our Fathers; and those Words of our Saviour's, *The Children are free*; were urged as a good Foundation for it in Scripture; and then they could at their pleasure make Canons and Decrees to confirm it; and sometimes also they got the Concurrence of the Civil Power to enact it into a Law; but there were always some, even of the Clergy, honest enough to oppose it; in the Civil Law, Constitutions were made against it; in this Kingdom, Statutes are enacted to suppress it; and notwithstanding the Canons, the Convening of Clerks before Secular Judges, was always practiced. But when the Tyranny of the Clergy began to be shook off at the Reformation, and it was clearly seen, that these Immunities had no other Foundation, but in their own Decrees; then Divers, even of those States that retained their Religion, did freely oppose them, and a great part of their own Clergy disowned and renounced them; but however, they were Jewels of too great a Value to be easily parted with, and therefore they were still maintained to the least Punctilio; by those, who were most devoted to the Interests of the Court of *Rome*: among these, the Jesuits have been always the Men, that have carried them to the greatest height, and have not been contented with many others of their Church, to found them upon Civil and Ecclesiastical Sanctions; but have asserted a *ius Divinum* for them, and so have made this Exemption of the Clergy, to be very near a kin to an Article of Faith, and almost downright Hero-

fy to deny it. *Bellarmin* and *Suarez*, the two greatest Men of their Order, have been also the stiffest Advocates of these Immunities; the former, at large, asserts them in his Book *de Clericis*, cited by *Amis-Cotton*, and in those Tracts which he wrote against *Barclay*, and the Apology of King *James*, and in * Defence of the Popes Cause against the *Venetians*; the latter spends a whole Book in his Defence of the Catholick Faith, in discussing the Controversy about them; in handling whereof, † he lays down this Conclusion, as certain and indubitable, That Clerks are exempted from the Civil Power, both by Divine and Humane Right, † Cap. 9. in all singious Causes, at least in which they are Defendants, and ∴ absolutely in all Criminal Causes whatsoever; and he adds, That those Laws in *Justinian*, which ordained that Clergy-men should be tried for Civil Crimes before Secular Tribunals, were null in themselves, because against the Laws of God and the Church. He † also, † Cap. 16. firms also, That they are not bound to obey Civil Laws, *Vi Jurisdictionis*, but only (as 'tis probable) *Vi Rationis*, which is, they are bound to obey only when they think fit; that he says, is also *Bellarmin's* Opinion: And in short, that Secular Laws have neither Directive nor Co-active Power over Clergy-Men; aggregably to which, he lays down this Resolution also, that their Goods and † Estates, as well Patrimonial and Temporal, as Ecclesiastical, are exempted from all Laws of Tribute and Taxation. And lastly †, all these Priviledges he extends † Cap. 24. to all their inferior Orders, such as Readers, Door-keepers, *Analges*, as well as to the Superior Orders of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons. Many other Authors of the Society might be added; but these I have alledged, may be presumed to speak the minds of all their Order, since it is one of their Constitutions, that there be no deformity of Doctrines among them, but that they all speak the same things, be of one Mind, of one Judgment. But if that Argument, which has been so much urged of late, have any force in it, That Kings have by the Laws of God and Nature, a right to the Service of all their Subjects; and that therefore, all Laws that debar them of this Right, are null in themselves; I hope, I may be allowed to draw these Inferences from it, That then that Church has grievously erred, that has made Canons and Decrees contrary to the

the Laws of God and Nature, to exempt those who were born Subjects to Princes, not only from serving them in some Offices of Trust, but also from all manner of Subjection and Obedience to them; and that the Defenders of such Decrees are not so tender of the Prerogative of Kings, as they would have it thought; but that they who will not allow Protestants for the Preservation of their Religion, to lay any Restrictions upon Subjects; may yet allow it lawful for the advancement of the Papal Power, to exempt many thousands of them from the Jurisdiction of Civil Magistrates. How pernicious this Principle is to Civil Government, and what horrid Consequences do naturally follow from it, is observed by *Anti-Cotton*. If it be once allowed, That Kings and States have no Jurisdiction over Church-men, then it follows, that they are not their Subjects; that as such, they are not under any Obligation of Fidelity to them; That when their Superiors command, they may attempt any thing against them, as a Subject commissioned by his Prince may fight against a foreign King; and that, lastly, whatever they attempt, they are not guilty of Treason against their King, nor can be punished as Traytors for it. This is nothing but the natural Result of exempting Clerks from Subjection to Princes; and what *Em. Sa.* thought fit to make an Aphorism, as *Antic.* urges. And let it be considered, what *Eudamon* Answers to it, 1. He would insinuate, that there was no such thing in that Author, because he could not find it in the Edition at *Rome*; but the Apologist confesses, that the Author had those Words; but in a second Edition, they were expunged; and why, I shall not stay to enquire. But 2. He endeavours to solve all by this honest Distinction, between two Classes of People in every Government: The 1st of those, who are Members of the Body Politick, or being not Members of it, are yet in Subjection to the Government, as soon as they enter into the Bounds of it: and these are the only Persons that can be guilty of Treason against it. For 2^{ly}, there are others, who are not properly subject, but are yet under the Protection of the Government, and enjoy the Benefit of it: and are therefore, obliged in point of Gratitude, and by the Law of Charity, to assist and defend it: Then he affirms, that the Ecclesiastics are only under this latter Obligation, and so concludes,

* That

* That 'tis most certain, that the right of Subjection cannot be violated by those, who are not subjects, and therefore they cannot (so speak properly) be guilty of Treason. The Result then is, That according to the Jesuits, Church-men are no Subjects to Civil Magistrates; That they are bound in Charity to live Peaceably under them; but if they Rebel, and endeavour to Depose and Murder Princes, 'tis ingratelully and uncharitably done, but they are not therefore guilty of Treason; neither have the Civil Magistrates power to Judge, Condemn, or Punish them for it.

* Certissimum est ius Subjectionis ab eo non Violari qui Subiectus non est, quare ne proprie quidem Majestatem ab eo laedi. p. 100.

adly. The next thing we are to consider, is the Doctrine of Equivocation, which our Author has charged upon them, wherein he first gives an account of the Equivocations of Garnet, in his Depositions about the Gunpowder-Conspiracy. By Virtue of this juggling Doctrine, this worthy Provincial, and Martyr for Treason, defended his own and his friends Perjuries, at his Arraignment, before all the World; and owned, that he had seen and allowed a Treatise Written purposely to maintain it. To this Eudæmon answers, That Garnet was not the Author of this Treatise. But however he owns, that such a Book was Written; which the Apologist peremptorily denies; tho the Book was then publickly known here in England, seen, and perused by many, and was taken notice of by Forreigners; and is still to be seen among the Bodly MSS. in which MSS. Garnet with his own Hand dashed out the first Title, *A Treatise of Equivocation*, and Substituted in its room, *A Treatise against Lying and Fraudulent Dissimulation*; and in the Close of it, there is an Approbation of Blackwell, Arch-Priest of England, and Apostolical Protonotary; wherein he commends it, as a Treatise very Learned, and truly Pious and Catholick, wherein the Lawfulness of Equivocation is Proved by Scriptures, Fathers, Doctors, Schoolmen, Canonists, and Reasons. This Art of Equivocation had before that been Zealously Taught and Defended by the Famous Jesuit Parsons, in his *Treatise of Mitigation*, Answered by Dr. Morton: So that it was then become a Famous Controversie, and the Jesuits were not ashamed to Write Books in Defence of so Lewd a Doctrine, which (as times were then) was very convenient.

.. Hospinian: 228, 229.
|| Foulis. 700.
A Treatise of Equivocation.

* E. 45. Laud. The design of it is to prove, that a Catholic or any other person being demanded upon his Oath, whether a Priest were in such a place, may (notwithstanding his perfect knowledge to the contrary) without Perjury, and secretly in Conscience, answer No, with this secret meaning reserved in his mind, that he was not there, so as that any man is bound to detect it. p. 1.

convenient for them. But farther, our * Author has shewed, how the Doctrine of Equivocation was avowed also by *Andrew Eudemon*, in his *Apology for Garnet*; and here *Eudemon* Triumphs mightily, as he had detected a manifest Forgery in him, because in his quoration he puts *Judicii*, instead of *Indicii*, and draws this Inference from

thence, That *Eudemon* there files the Justice of the Kings of England, exercised upon the Jesuits, an unjust Jurisdiction. But must this be nothing else but downright Forgery? Does not the Similitude of the Letter prove it to be only an easy and innocent mistake? And granting that Inference not to follow from *Eudemon's* Words, yet what wrong has he done the Jesuits in it? For do they not all maintain, That Clerks are exempt from secular Jurisdiction? And does it not thence follow, that such Jurisdiction when it is assumed, is unjust? But let us see what our Answerers say to the Doctrine itself, that is charged upon them; *Eudemon* thus resolves the case, That if a Lawful Judge proceed according to a due form of Law, the Criminal is bound to answer truly at the peril of his Life; but if not, then all allow it, says he, Lawful peremptorily to deny the Truth, with the old Mental Reservation, *Senior Dicere*, that is, as far as I am bound to discover it. The * Apologist reduces the opinion of their Divines in this matter, to these three heads.

1. That both Ecclesiasticks and Laicks, when they are judicially Examined, are bound to Answer without Equivocation.
2. That this Equivocation is never to be used, but in a case of necessity.
3. That when any one is Interrogated by those who have no Jurisdiction over him, or do not proceed according to Law against him, he may then Lawfully Equivocate. This is fair and ingenuous, and so there is no colour for complaints of being misrepresented in this point.

Another passage, Cited to this purpose, by our Author, is

That

That one of *Sylveſter*, before urg-
ed by *Eudæmus* in his Apology
for *Garnet*, and in this Answer, is
again approved and commended by
him. * This passage ſeems to com-
prehend the whole Doctrine of E-
quivocating before Judges in its ut-
moſt latitude, and I ſhall take liber-
ty to make theſe Reflections on it.

1. That all Eccleſiaſticks are
hereby allow'd to Equivocate be-
fore a Civil Judge, becauſe they are

not *ſimpliciter Subditi*. *ſed* *ſub*
2. That any other Criminal has the ſame License, if he
can find any flaw in the Proceedings; nay, if he only thinks or
doubts, that they are not juridical, (ſo ſays *Leſſius* Ex-

preſſy.
3. That if a Judge be not Legal, or acts illegally, 'tis as
worth but a venial ſin to lye before him; And

4. That if a Man be not a Blockhead, he may avoid com-
mitting even a venial ſin alſo, by Answering cunningly, and
ſophiſtically, and handſomly impoſing upon his Judge, by words
of an ambiguous and double Sence. How Destructive ſuch

Politions are to all Civil Juſtice, and Government, and how
directly they tend to Legitimate Perjury, and to ſuperſede
the uſe of all Oaths and Examinations in Courts of Judica-
ture, let every one judge. 'Tis true, the preſent Pope *Innocent*

the 11th, has Condemned all ſuch Equivocations and Mental
Reſervations, in ſwearing, as at leaſt Scandalous and Pernici-
ous in Practice. But how can he ſcandalous or pernicious

to practice a Doctrine Authoriſed by Popes, and Fathers, and
Doctors, and Recommended by the Examples of Holy Men
in Scripture, and even of our Saviour himſelf in the Goſpel,
(for all theſe the Jeſuits alledg for themſelves.) I leave to

the Defenders of Papal Infallibility to conſider. But how little
Account has been made of that Decree, wherein this Doctrine
of Equivocation is Condemned, the World has been largely in-
formed. And it is not likely, that the Jeſuits, who aſſume a

kind of Infallibility to themſelves, and never Recant what

In verbo Accuſatio. Not in the fifth
Accuſation. For Anti-book v. for 5.

* Quando Index iudicis non procedit,
vel quia accuſatus non eſt ei ſubditus ſim-
plicitèr, vel in hoc caſu, aut quacunque alia
cauſa, tam licet mendacium eſt illicitum,
non tamen eſt mortale, quia non eſt contra
debitum juſtiſicæ, nec in iudicio vero, ſed
in iuriparato; imò non eſt etiam veniale, ſi
reſpondendo cauteloſe aut ſophiſticè di-
cant aliquid falſum apud ſenſum iudicis, &
apud ſuum verum.

De iure &
Juſtitiæ lib. 2.
cap. 3. De 3.
R. 10.

De iure &
Juſtitiæ lib. 2.
cap. 3. De 3.
R. 10.

De iure &
Juſtitiæ lib. 2.
cap. 3. De 3.
R. 10.

De iure &
Juſtitiæ lib. 2.
cap. 3. De 3.
R. 10.

De iure &
Juſtitiæ lib. 2.
cap. 3. De 3.
R. 10.

prevent the destruction of the Innocent, an Universal Conflagration of the world, or the ruine and overthrow of all Religion in it. And yet there was another Jesuit in France, that said a bolder thing than this (and his King James that Reluctant Protestant our Lord Jesus Christ was being) *that he would rather see the King of France dead, than see the King of France suffer Jesus Christ to be slain.* One would think that the Jesuits held nothing Sacred but Confession, and that they notwithstanding it to be the Sum of all the Law, and the Prophets, and of the Gospel itself. But this is their great Design, and the chief interest of all the Christians to stickle for them.

A passage parallel to these, is related by Anti-Cotton, being an Account of what was declared to Casaubon, by Fronto the Jesuit, concerning Confession, and here the Apologist with great triumph produces part of a Letter from Casaubon, wherein he absolutely disavows that he had any Discourse with Fronto about it. But Casaubon in the same Epistle asserted, that the Jesuit *Fronto* maintained to him in the King's Library, That it was better all Kings should be killed, than the Confession revealed. *Fronto* being also then in the Library, but not hearing the Discourse: So that the substance of what *Fronto* Casaubon relates, is undoubtedly true; but clearly, such a Doctrine was maintained by a Jesuit, and all that can be made of this mistake of Anti-Cotton is, That he was not exactly informed of all the Circumstances of the Story: Had the Apologist therefore, inserted the whole Letter, it would have cleared the matter. But he thought fit to suppress what was not to his advantage, and Casaubon had reason to reflect on this Candor and Honesty for it. Our Author has sufficiently exposed the Impiety of this Doctrine, and shewed, how dangerous it is to Government, how contrary to the Laws of God and Nature, how it tends to incite men unto Treason, and implies an approbation of it. To this *Eudemus* replies, That merely to conceal Treason, is not to encourage or approve it. But the Laws of all Nations, and the common Sense of all men do so interpret it, and the concealers of Treason have been ever reputed and punished as consenters and promoters of it. He urges also (as the other Defenders of this Doctrine usual

the Court
of the

|| Casaub. Ep.
ad Frontonem
Ducum. p.
140.

|| Ibid. 142.

|| Ibid. 142.

ly do) that the discovery of such secrets in Confession is for the safety of Kings; for the Priest, if he discharge his duty, will dissuade the Conspirator from his design; but then the Confessor must not be a Jesuit, for such a one (if he acts consequently to his principles) will sometimes encourage the fact, as glorious in it self, beneficial to the Church, and meritorious in the person that attempts it.

The same *Euclamen* denies what *Antic.* affirms, that 'tis the opinion of the *Sorbon*, that Treason revealed in Confession ought to be discovered; but it is evident from * *Thuanus*, that this was at that time generally believed to be the Doctrine of that Faculty, and that so it was presumed by the Parliament of *Paris*. But further, he cites *Suarez*, affirming the contrary to be the opinion of all the Divines and Canonists, except *Alfisdorpius*; and adds, that the chief foundation of their opinion is the common consent and universal tradition of the Church. This Universal tradition is the great Topick by which they prove all their Doctrines; and a Jesuit scorns to make the least abatement of his pretences to it, when he is proving any thing; especially when the power of the Pope, the Dignities and Immunities of Churchmen, the Inexhaustible Mine of Confession, or any of their other wealthy Doctrines are concerned, then so be sure, Universal tradition, the authority of the Church, the Decrees of Councils, and all the Canonists and Divines, must be all pressed to serve them.

All the Divines (says * *Suarez*) excepting one, do agree, that the seal of Confession is for no cause to be broken; but he had forgot the resolution of the inextinguishable Dr. *Alexander de Ale* in this point: *That if a person confess a crime, be resolved to commit it, and will not be dissuaded from it, then the Priest is not bound to conceal it, that he ought not indeed to reveal it, unless some great inconvenience be likely to ensue; but in such a case, 'tis no breach of his duty; nay, it is bound to reveal it.* And he gives this reason for it: *That the Priest in confession stands in the room of God, to reconcile sinners to him; but all reconciliation is for sins already committed, not such as are designed to be committed hereafter: whenever it follows, that the Priest is not appointed by God to receive*

Sacerdos solum confessionem revelare potest, condemnari tanquam violator sigilli confessionis.

* Hist. Cont.
p. 219.

* *Suarez* Tom.
4. Disp. 33.
Sec. 1. § 1. 11
† *Alex. de*
Ales. Venice.
pars 4ta, Q.
19. Artic. 2. in
resol. Poreft
quis confiteri
peccatum, ut
est in propo-
sito de futu-
ro, in hoc casu
non tenetur
celare simpli-
titer, nec si
sigilli confessionis.

the confession of future sins, and therefore is not bound to conceal them. To the same purpose many others might be added, but this testimony of *Alensis* may suffice to shew, that the Divines are not so unanimous in this point, as that Jesuit in the height of his confidence affirms.

If any one has the curiosity to know the grounds upon which this obligation to secrecy, even in cases of Treason is, they are briefly such as these; † *Valentia* founds it upon the † Tom 4 Disp. 7. Q. 3. P. 1. natural precepts of fidelity, justice, and charity, which forbid the publishing any secret committed to us, to the prejudice of our neighbour; upon the Laws of the Church, which enjoyn inviolable secrecy; and upon those Divine Laws, which enjoyn Sacramental Confession, and are therefore supposed to enjoyn whatsoever is requisite to encourage the practice of it; which (they say) a security, that what is confessed shall not be discovered, is, because were there no such security, it would hinder and discourage men from the use of confession. *Suarez* rejects all other reasons as insufficient, and acquiesces in this last alone. *Vasquez* thinks nothing will suffice but a positive divine precept, yet produces none. *Aquinas* grounds it upon a meer congruity, that the Priest represents God in receiving Confessions, but God does not discover what is confessed to him, and therefore it is not fitting the Priest should do it. Others ground it chiefly upon the publick faith; which the Church gives unto all Penitents that come to Confession. And lastly, some have assigned this reason, why a design against the life of a King, revealed in confession should not be discovered; That the institution of Kings was of humane right, but Confession was of divine right.

These are the sandy foundations upon which they have built this monstrous opinion; and they serve only to discover what a mean opinion the defenders of it have of the great evils of Treason and Rebellion, and of the horrid impiety of murdering the Ministers and Vicegerents of God upon earth. Did they believe that to conceal Treason was a thing evil in itself, by the Laws of God and Nature, that it was the highest degree of infidelity, injustice, and uncharitableness to betray Kings, and not to prevent the ruin and destruction of whole Kingdoms when it is in their power, they would never make

that which they esteem an Ordinance of God, a band of iniquity, and turn the Institution of Christ into a Sacrament of Rebellion. It is a rule which themselves teach as certain in Divinity, That all compacts, promises, and oaths which oblige to any thing in its self unlawful, are void, and thence follow. That granting Confession to imply a compact or Secrecy, it cannot be extended to any thing unlawful to be concealed, or which we are antecedently obliged to discover. Now the Laws of God do manifestly oblige us to do all we lawfully can, for the Preservation of our King and Country, and therefore also, to reveal Treason discovered in Confession, unless some plain and evident Law of God do forbid it; for Implications, and remote Inferences, are not sufficient to supersede the Obligation of plain and evident Duties; and to argue, that he who commands Confession of Sin, does forbid the discovery of Crimes designed to be committed, is a consequence as absurd, as can well be imagined. Suppose that the discovery of such Crimes should accidentally hinder some wicked Persons among them from confessing their Sin, must a known Duty be therefore omitted, because it may be accidentally the occasion of Sin to another? Or must I by a pernicious Silence, suffer a whole Kingdom to be ruined, for fear of discouraging Villains, to confess Crimes, of which they show no Repentance, but still design to commit, even when they confess them? And therefore, according to their own Doctrine, are not sacramentally confessed, and consequently have no right to the Seal of Sacramental Confession.

One thing nearly discovereth the wickedness of these abominable Casuists: for tho' they scruple the lawfulness of revealing unperceived Treason; nay, esteem it a Crime greater than Seizing it self; yet they make no Scruple in the Defence of the Arbitrary Doctrine, as to teach the lawfulness of, as plain and downright Treason, as can be committed; they unanimously teach with *Calvin*, That if a Magistrate upon Oath, requires a Priest to declare what was revealed to him in Confession, he may fairly and plainly deny it; understanding that he did not so hear it, as to tell it, or forming some other Equivocation in his Mind;

for (say they) he is not bound to answer directly to the design of the Question; but may delude him that interrogates, by telling him some other impertinent Truth, which he may either express in ambiguous Words, or solve by a mental Reservation. But if this be not plain and evident Perjury, there can be certainly no such thing in the World, for to give false Testimony after a solemn Oath to declare the Truth, is precise Perjury in the

sense of all Men; now, that which is reserved in the Mind, is no part of the Testimony, and therefore cannot make it true, nor consequently save him from swearing falsely, and so contracting the horrible Guilt of Perjury upon his Soul.

2. The last Doctrine, which I shall here consider, is, That of blind Obedience, which Ignatius, the Founder of their Order, has at large enjoined them in his Constitutions, and recommended to them in a long Epistle to his Portugal Brethren, and the substance of what he enjoins them is this. 1. As to the matter of the superiour command, they must obey, not only in things Obligatory, but in other things indefinitely.

2. As to the manner of Execution, they must perform what is commanded, intirely, readily, strenuously, and with the greatest Expedition; so that if they chance to be writing when they receive a command, they must not finish a single Letter they have begun, but in that very instant go about the performance of it. 3. As to the Dispositions of their Minds, they must not have the least repugnance in their Wills or understandings to the thing commanded, but the Will and Judgement of the Superior must be the Rule of theirs, which they must blindly follow without any Disquisition of it, and persuade themselves that all things are just and lawful, which are commanded by him. Nay they must perfectly deny their own Wills and Judgements, and only Act by those of their Superiours. And lastly, be as Carcases and Slaves in their hands, which having no Sense or Motion of their own, may be moved, and managed as they please. And 4. as to the

Person

* Valentia Tom. 4. Diss. 7. Qu. 13. punc. 4. Potest Confessor jurare se nescire, intelligendo semper in dicat, aut aliquam aliam similem Amphibologiam, mente concipiendo; non enim teneris responsonem ullo modo conformare ad formam interrogationis, intentionemque Interrogantis, quin omnino potes non deludere, dicendo aliam impertinentem veritatem, quam vel Amphibologias per se Verbis explices, vel partim verbis exprimas, partim mente concipias.

Person of their Superior, they must not look upon him as a Man, obnoxious to Error and Misery, but they must regard him, as if he were Jesus Christ, or God himself, in whom resides infinite Wisdom and Goodness, and who will supply the want of Understanding or Honesty, or whatsoever else is defective in them. These are the Rules and Measures of the blind Obedience, which is the peculiar Characteristick of the Society, and which the World was never acquainted with before these last days, in which (if I may be permitted to transcribe the Blasphemy of *Pedro Dera*) God has spoken to us by his Son *Ignatius*, whom he hath appointed Heir of all things. *Anti-Cotton* has plainly shew'd the Design and Tendency of this prodigious Doctrine, that it is the Source and Spring of all their Contrivances and Attempts against the Civil Powers; that it is calculated to facilitate the Execution of the most bloody Designs: And that hereby any Jesuit, if he be commanded to Assassinate any Man, is bound instantly to put it in Execution, without so much as casting an Eye upon the Unlawfulness, the Danger, or Difficulty of it.

Eudamon in his Answer to this Charge, alleges two things, which must be considered; 1. That it is not true, that the Jesuits are obliged by Vow to this blind Obedience, but that it is recommended to them only as a matter of Council and Perfection.

But in the very words of their I Vow, seem plainly to comprehend this blind Obedience in them; for after their vowing Poverty, Chastity, and perpetual Obedience in the Society of Jesus, it follows, *I promise that I will enter into the same Society, to live perpetually in it, understanding all things according to the Constitutions of it.* Now *Suarez* proves

that this last Clause, notwithstanding the word Promise before it, is yet a part of the Vow. And therefore blind Obedience being employ'd in those Constitutions, it seems evident that in other Obedience can be understood in this Vow, because those Constitutions are the Rule by which all are to be interpreted in it. Yet 2^{dy}, because the same Author affirms, that blind

|| *Hospinian Historia Jesu* p. 57. Voto eorum Sacratissima Virgine Maria, & curia tua celesti Universa Divina Majestati tue paupertatem Castitatem & Obedientiam perpetuam in Societate Jesu, & promitto eandem Societatem me ingressurum, ut Vitam in eo perpetuo degam, omnia intelligendo juxta ipsius Societatis Constitutiones.

† *Suarez Tom. 4. de religione lib. 4. ch. 12. Sect. 10.*

Obedience is not rigorously a part of their Vow, but only recommended *sub conditione*. Let this be granted them, still it is prescribed as a Virtue of great Merit and Perfection, and this is inclement enough to a Jesuit, blindly to execute what commandsoever his Superior enjoyns him. And yet yet further here to be observed, that Suarez, discussing what precisely belongs to their Vow, lays down that Constitution of Ignatius as his Foundation, *That the Superior has a right to command anything that tends to the ends for which the Society was instituted, viz. The Good of their Neighbour, and the Glory of God.* And hence he infers, That those things which are necessary or convenient for the attaining those ends, are rightly comprehended in the matter of the Vow; whence it will follow, that the Jesuits are obliged, even by their Vow, to obey their General, when, for instance, he commands them to execute the Sentence of the Pope against any Prince; because it is a part of their Faith, that the Pope has a judicial Power over Princes, which he is to make use of for the Glory of God, and the good of Souls: And whatever is necessary or expedient for those ends, is contained under the precise matter of the Vow, and may therefore lawfully be commanded, and must by them be necessarily obeyed. *2dly, Anti-Cotton's Answerers Reply*, that in this, that this blind Obedience is recommended without any Limitation, because it is thus qualified in their Constitution, *That they must obey in all things, which are not discern'd to be sinful.* And in Ignatius's Epistles, *In all things in which there is no manifest Sin.* But how far this miserable Shift is from justifying the Impiety of this stupid Obedience, will appear from these two Considerations.

1. That this Exception of discerning sin in the thing commanded, can signifie nothing to those, who are supposed to be *Regule Soci.* blind, and must not use their own Judgment in discerning any: *Jes. Lugduni.* *Const. 31.* How can a blind Man see? Or he, who has intirely *Conenrur interi-* *mentem & veram abnegationem propriæ voluntatis & iudicii habere.* 35. *Omnia* *hæc esse vobis persuadendo, omnem Sententiam ac iudicium vestrum cæca quadam Obe-* *diencia abnegando.* 36. *Sinere debent penite ac si cadaver essent aut fenis baculus.* *Ign-* *anti Ep.* ad ea facienda quæcunque superior dixerit, cæco quodam imperio voluntatis pa- *reant capite sine ulla prorsus Disquisitione ferantur.* *Superioris vocem ac iussa non secus* *at Christi vocem exipite.*

renounc'd all use of his own Understanding, understand the falseness of any thing propounded to him? Can a Stick, or a Cardass perform the Actions of Sense and Reason? Or is it to be imagin'd that one, who receives the command of his Superior, as the Voice of Christ, and thinks it an Impiety to list and examine it, should be capable of inspecting and discerning the unlawfulness of it? * Suarez himself acknowledges this to be the property of blind obedience, That the prudential judgment directing it, is founded on the Superiors judgment, and that as a blind man is led by another man, and sees by another's eyes, so is the subject to be manag'd by his Superior. And is it not absurd then, after all this, to put in Cautions about discerning the falseness of the Superior's command? 'tis just as if a man after he had put out a traveller's eyes, should command him to follow him, whether he should lead him, unless he should see a precipice before him; for 'tis, I think, as difficult for a man that has renounc'd his understanding, to discern sin, as 'tis for a blind man to see a precipice.

20. Granting that this limitation may signify something, yet it cannot be apply'd to the case before us; I mean it cannot secure the lives of Princes, should their Superiors command the Jesuits to destroy them. For it is their Doctrine (as * Suarez delivers it at large) that be there never so great a degree of probability that the thing commanded by the Superior be unlawful; yet the authority of the Superior ought in practice to outweigh it; and that therefore nothing can discharge the subject from his duty of obedience, but only the greatest certainty (that men are capable of in practical and moral matters) that the thing is intrinsically evil; and not so only by positive Laws. And yet further, to make all sure at last, he affirms, That if the person commanding be a learned, prudent, and religious person, tho the judgment of the subject was before the command morally certain of the lawfulness, yet the command of a person so qualified, does † destroy that moral certainty, and make the thing probably lawful, and then the obligation to obedience does again take place. Hence it follows, that since the Doctrine of the Pope's power of deposing Princes has been taught and approved by a great number of those who have been esteemed the most prudent, learned, and religious Fathers of that Society,

* Ibid. c. 15.
Sect. 27.

* Ibid. c. 15.
Sect. 21.

† Ibid. Sect.
23. Tollit
consequenter
moralem cer-
titudinem
prioris judicii
& tunc locum
habet obedi-
entie efficaci-
tas.

ty, and that not only as a probable Doctrine (tho even that would be sufficient) but as absolutely certain, and *de fide*; whenever the Pope or the General of their Order by Commission from him, shall command a Jesuit to stab any Prince he has condemn'd, his obligation to a blind obedience must according to this Hellish doctrine indispensibly bind him to do it. And such a command to one that has been educated in the belief of that deposing principle, will be so far from being suspected unlawful, that it must necessarily be look'd upon as highly meritorious. And therefore 'tis evident the exception of things manifestly sinful can signify nothing for the security of Princes, against the practice of those, whose avowed principle it is that the deposition of them is so far from being a manifest sin, that it is a manifest duty.

I have now done with the Doctrines charged upon the Jesuits, by *Anti-Gorton*. Upon the whole 'tis, I hope, undeniably evident, That the lawfulness of deposing and killing Kings, with all its train of other inferior doctrines subservient to it, have been justly imputed to this holy Society. I will not be afraid to affirm, That the existence of a Deity, the truth of a future judgment, or any other fundamental article of Religion, have not been more plainly taught and asserted by the writers of that Order, than the aforementioned doctrines. But yet 'tis their practice that is the most convincing proof of their doctrine, and the frequent attempts of their Instruments against the lives of Princes, the clearest demonstration of the guiltiness of their Principles. For these doctrines of theirs have not been maintained as meer Speculative truths, but have been frequently reduc'd to practice; were first written in the Books of Divines, and then in the blood of Kings. This therefore the Author of *Anti-Corruption* chose as the best method to convict the Jesuits by, proving first out of their Authors, that they approv'd the Parricide of Kings; and then shewing in several instances, that they actually fomented and promoted it. It remains therefore in the last place, to justify the truth of those several facts, which *Anti-Gorton* has charg'd upon the Jesuits, that so it may appear that their practice has been such as their doctrines; and that our Author has done them no injury in laying at their doors the murder of Kings, and destruction of Kingdoms.

The Answerers (with a confidence essential to Jesuits) deny almost all the matters of fact, which our Author has advanced, and will not allow any one thing to be true which makes against them; but I shall spare my self the labour of examining every particular objection they urge. When the question is about Historical matters, all that is requisite to clear the truth of them, is only to produce the testimony of good Historians to confirm them, such proofs have been always thought sufficient; and the matters themselves are not capable of stronger. If therefore such Historical evidence can be brought for the passages contested, it must be acknowledg'd that all exceptions against them are of no force, and that there can be no reason to question the truth of them.

First then, I begin with the passages relating to *Garnet*, Provincial of the Jesuits, and the Gun-powder Conspiracy. The Answerers of *Anti-Cotton* (as all other writers of that time that have occasion to mention it) do freely own the truth of the Conspiracy it self; for that modern impudent forgery, that it was a Sham-plot of *Cecil's* contrivance, was not then thought of: But that which after *Bellarmin* they say in vindication of *Garnet* is, that he knew nothing of the design but what was reveal'd to him under the seal of Confession, and which he could not therefore discover; and they also peremptorily deny that any of the Jesuits were concerned in it. But to vindicate the truth of this matter, it is sufficient to appeal to the * authentick relation of the proceedings against the Conspirators, to the credit of which no reasonable objection can be made. There we find that *Garnet*, *Treshmond*, *Gerard*, and *Hall*, all Fathers of the Society, were not only conscious of the Villany, but also the encouragers of it; that they confirm'd the Conspirators in their design, by convincing them that it was lawful, nay meritorious; that they devis'd an Oath of Secrecy, and gave them the Sacrament to keep and retain them in that detestable Confederacy, and were all along the great agents and privy Counsellors of the Conspiracy. And as for *Garnet's* not knowing any thing of it but by Sacramental confession, the contrary was evidently proved at his Trial; and in effect plainly confessed by *Garnet* himself at his Execution: *For when he had declar'd upon the Scaffold that he had only a general knowledge of the Plot by*

* Reprinted
by the Bishop
of Lincoln,
1679.

¶ Ibid. p. 225.

Catesby, but what he knew in particular was in Confession; he was put in mind by the Recorder, that the King had under his hand writing these four Points among others:

1. That Greenway told him of it by way of Consultation.
2. That Catesby and Greenway came together to him to be resolved.
3. That Tesmond and he had conference in particular of the Powder-Treason in Essex long after.

4. Greenway had asked him who should be Protector? But Garnet said, That was to be referred till the Blow was past; these said he, prove your privacy, besides Confession, and these are extant under your own hand: Garnet answered, Whatsoever was under his hand, was true. And for that he disclosed not to his Majesty the things which he knew, he confessed himself justly Condemn'd, and for this did ask Forgiveness of his Majesty. There are many other convictive Evidences of the Guilt of that Miserable Man.

Casaubon in the aforementioned Epistle to Fronto Ducens, sets himself purposely to shew the falshood of what the Apologist and other Jesuits had alledg'd in his Vindication; and shews how deep he was in the Conspiracy, by demonstrative proofs out of the Original Writings, Tryals, and Letters of Garnet, which by the King's Order was delivered to him for that purpose. This might be further confirmed out of King James's Apology for the Oath of Allegiance: Bishop Andrews Tortura Torii, and Abbot's Antilogion, in answer to Eudæmon's Apology for Garnet; and lastly, out of the Historians of our own and other Nations. And if against such a cloud of Witnesses, 'tis sufficient for Bellarmen, and after him Suarez, Eudæmon, and other Jesuits, to produce the single Testimony of one fugitive nameless Evidence, who was then in England; and after assured the Cardinal at Rome, that Garnet never confessed his Guilt, but denied it at his Death; I see not how it is possible to be assured of any matter of Fact, either past or present; But there is nothing so Evident but may be on such Testimony contradicted; and if what is contradicted must not be believ'd, we must become downright Sceptics, and believe nothing at all.

Osborns Memoirs of K. James. Sir R. Baker, Thuanus, Mexgray.

The other matters of Fact related by Anti-Cotton, were Trans-

Transacted in *France*, and are most of them confirmed and delivered by the Historiographers of that Nation; especially *Thuanus*, a writer of unquestionable sincerity and veracity. I do not pretend that every minute particular related by this Author, is delivered also by those Historians; there are some passages which they might not take notice of, there are others which perhaps they durst not relate, because the times would not bear it. But that which I undertake to shew, is, That the most considerable passages; those that directly tend to verify the charge of King-killing against the Jesuits, are sufficiently asserted by them.

Thuanus, giving an account of the many Artifices that were

* *Accedente ad hoc sacri ordinis favore, & quorundam Religiosorum non segni Operâ, & Jesuitarum patrum imprimis, qui Fascinatam per scrupulosas in Arcanis Confessionibus quæstiones, plebem sensim a principis obsequio alienatam ad defectionem sollicitabant.* Tom. 3. lib. 75. p. 561. *Those words [Jesuitarum patrum imprimis] were in the Original Copy of Thuanus, but the Jesuits got them Expung'd, and therefore they are not in the common Edition. Vide Thuanum restitutum Amstelodami. Ann. 1663. p. 49.*

† Lib. 14. p. 661. *the first Authors and continual sowers of the League. And Achilles de Harlay, the first President of the Parliament of Paris,*

‡ *Thuan. Lib. 132. p. 1125. the other Religious Orders were not universally Rebels, and that many of them constantly persever'd in their Loyalty to the King, but the Jesuits unanimously conspir'd against him, and there was not found one single Royalist in the whole Society. In the same place he affirms, That the Jesuits were the men that Animated the People to Rebel against Henry the 3d, and that they were not thought innocent in the Murder of him. * There were some that affirm'd, That Jaques Clement had acquainted Father Comoles and other Jesuits with his design of Stabbing the King; But however that*

* *Foulis 547.*

that

that be, *Thuanus* assures us, That he was inclined to commit that prodigious Parricide by the Eloquent Declamations of the Preachers, and the Disputations of the Novices, the Divines, and most especially the Jesuits, who maintain'd it Lawful to kill a Tyrant. And when the Fact was committed, there were divers of their Order, that in their Writings Magnified it with the highest Encomiums, as a Magnanimous and Heroick Action; so that if encouraging and exciting Assassins to attempt such a Murder before it was perform'd, and approving and commending it after, are enough to make any one an accessory at least, 'tis evident that the Jesuits were not unconcern'd in it.

Thuanus Resistorus p. 84.

His Successor *Henry 4th*, was all his Life long beleaguerr'd with Assassins † *Mezeray* tells us, That he had discovered above fifty Conspiracies against his Person, many of them contriv'd or foisted by Church-men, or some of the Religious Orders.

† *Mezeray*,
Translated by
John Bulstrope,
p. 941.

Anno. 1593. One *Pierre Barriere* was engaged in a design to stab him. *Anti-Coston* says, That *Varade* (the Rector of the Jesuits Colledg) was Conscious of this Detestable Attempt; but the Answerers flatly deny it. Yet † *Davila*, *Mezeray*, and *Thuanus* do all Affirm, That he was Guilty of it. *Thuanus* gives a large account of the Conspiracy, and says, That this Villain came to *Paris*, and being brought to *Aubre Curat* of *S. Andre des Arcs*, was by him encouraged in his Resolution, and afterward to confirm him in it, carried to *Varade*, who rid him of all his Scruples, and Animated him to perform the Fact; and for that purpose took care, that he should be fortified with the Sacraments of Confession and the Eucharist; and so the Villain, being thoroughly instructed, buys him a Knife, and goes directly to *St. Dennis* (where the King then was) to Execute his Design. There he had an opportunity to give the Blow, but he felt something within him that restrain'd and disabled him; Thence he followed his Majesty to *Melun*, where upon Discovery of the Plot, he was Apprehended and Imprison'd: being Examined, he at last confessed all, and was executed. The Historian concludes his Relation of this Attempt, with this Digression. That upon this occasion the hatred of the Jesuits was renewed, as being the men that had not only been the first Trumpeters of the Rebellion; but were also said by their impious Sermons and their wicked Doctrines, to have exposed the sacred Persons

|| History of
the Civil Wars
of France, p.
627. *Mezeray*,
838. *Thuanus*,
Lib. 107 p. 384.

Ibid: p. 385.

Persons

Persons of Princes to promiscuous slaughter. Hereby they gave a most pernicious Example to others; and it was not long before the Divine Vengeance overtook them: For Ibo Sixtus the 5th, had Excommunicated Navar and Conde, yet this he did rather out of necessity, because he was obliged to confirm the acts of his Predecessor, being over-reached by the Jesuits, than out of his own will and inclinations; and therefore afterwards he repented of it, and for that cause Banished Claude Matthew, the Agent of the Holy League in Italy and Spain, to Loretto, where he perished in great misery. And another factious Demagogue in Paris, called Odo Piginus, a perfect Fury, who rag'd beyond all bounds in his turbulent Preachments, was at length punished with a real Pörenx, and breath'd out his Soul in the midst of horrid Curses and dreadful Agonies.

The next employ'd to Assassinate the King, was John Chastel; And what our Author has related concerning him, tho deni'd also by the Answerers, may be justified by the same Authorities.

The three Historians just now mention'd, do all agree in making the Jesuits guilty of the Parricide. * In his Interrogatories, he confess'd that he was prompted to commit this Crime, because finding himself laden with heinous and unpardonable Sins, and imagining he could not avoid the Torments of Hell, he thought at least to diminish them by this attempt, which he believed to be a meritorious act; for that, said he, the King not being reconcil'd to the Church, could be nought but a Tyrant. Davila adds, † That he confess'd, and afterwards verified his Confession, That he was bred up in the Schools of the Jesuits, and had often heard it discoursed and disputed, that it was not only lawful, but also meritorious to kill Henry of Bourbon, a relapsed Heresick, and Persecutor of the Holy Church, who falsely appropriated to himself the Title of the K. of France. And to the same purpose, Thuanus ‡, who tells us also, That the Chastel, tho not above 19 years old, was guilty of monstrous and unnatural Vices, and yet was a Person of such esteem with the Jesuits, that they admitted him into their secret Conferences, and their exercises of Piety, as they call them. Mezeray § says, He confessed he had made his Exercises in the Colledg of Clermont under the Jesuits, and that they had often led him into a Chamber of Meditations, where Hell was represented with several most frightful Figures.

1 be

* Mezeray,
843.

† Ibid. l. 14.
661.

‡ Lib. 3. p. 517.

§ Ibid.

The Story of Guignard, as *Anti-Cotton* tells it, p. — is more largely related by * *Thuanus*. The *Apologift* seems unwilling to hear any more of him, and to confels him guilty. But *Eudæmon* Apologizes for him, as *Richeome* had done before, That in his Papers he only discuft some Scholastical questions, and that St. *Thomas*, and the other Schoolmen might as well have been accused of Atheism for difputing about the Existence of a God, as this man of Treason: But the Schoolmen always confute the Objections they raife, and conclude the contrary. *Guignard* Dogmatically asserted his Treasonable positions, and peremptorily concluded, That the King must be murder'd. But the Parliament of *Paris* took no notice of these niceties; for *Guignard* having own'd his Libels, was condemn'd to be hanged, and the Jesuits had only the poor comfort of making a Problematical Martyr of him.

* *Ibid.* 520.
p. 10, 11.

† The Parliament upon this business of *Chastel* and *Guignard* called to mind all the old Villanies of the Jesuits; it was remembered that they had been the Authors of the Rebellion; that they had manifested great zeal for the Interest of *Spain*, and were all along the corrupters of Youth, and the Preachers of Sedition. The Treasonable Speeches of Father *Alexander Hays*, a Scotchman, mentioned by *Anti-Cotton*, were prov'd; as also of Father *Gnevet*, Master in Philosophy, and the Ordinary Confessor of *Chastel*: Wherefore the Parliament after many debates, resolv'd to involve the whole Society in the punishment of these crimes: By a solemn Decree they condemn'd *Chastel* to suffer the pains accusom'd for the like Parricides; and did likewise ordain that the Priests and Students of the Colledg of Clermont, and others calling themselves of the Society of *Jesus*, as being corrupters of youth, disturbers of the common peace, and enemies to the King and State, should in three days leave the House and Colledge, and in fifteen the whole Kingdom; and that what belonged to them should be employed in pious uses, as the Parliament should dispose of it. In another Decree *Hays* and *Gnevet* were condemn'd to perpetual banishment. After that, another Jesuit call'd *John le Belle*, was sentenc'd to make the honourable amends, to have his Goods confiscated, and be for ever banish'd. And then it was ordain'd that the house of *Chastel*, the Delinquent's Father, should be demolish'd, and a Pyramid in its place of carv'd

† *Mexeray*, p. 843. and *Davis*, p. 651.

Thuanus, *ibid.* p. 519 *Mexeray*, *ibid.*

Thuan. *ibid.* p. 520.

Mezeray, *Ibid.*
vid. Foulis, p.
392.

stone erected, which should contain the cause of it. Upon one of the four Faces was the Decree engraven, and on the other three, divers *Latin* Inscriptions in Verse and Prose, in detestation of the memory of that horrid attempt, and that Doctrine of the Jesuits which was held to be the occasion of it.

Thuanus, *ibid.*
p. 521. *Judi-*
cibus qui cau-
sam compe-
rendinaverant
succensens,
subjecit hæc
verba, ergo
oportuit Jesui-
tas ex ore meo
convinci?
Thuan lib. 129.
p. 1049.

It is evident that the King himself thought the Jesuits guilty, and approved the Decree that proscrib'd them. *Thuanus* relates, That when the Princes and Nobles came to visit Him after he had been wounded in the mouth by *Chastel*, the King declared himself offended at the Judges, that had deferred giving Judgment against the Jesuits at the suit of the University of *Paris*; and added these words, *Was it then necessary that the Jesuits should be convicted by my own mouth?* And when Anno 1603. the King was resolv'd on their restitution, and had admitted *Armandus* the Provincial to speak for his Order in a long Harangue before him, even then he declar'd to them, *That what his Court of Parliament had decreed against them, they had not decreed it without good grounds, and mature deliberations.*

ll Pag. 907.

The Jesuits after their Banishment, never ceas'd by all imaginable Artifices, to solicit their Restitution. *¶ Mezeray* tells us, *They had great Intrigues at Court; they had very Potent Friends there, who urg'd that none but they were capable to instruct Youth, and convert the Hugonots; but their most prevalent Solicitor was William Fouquet la Varenne, Comptroller General of the Post-Offices, who from the meanest Employments of the King's House, had raised himself to the Cabinet by those Complaisances and Ministries, which are the most agreeable to the Great Ones.* It must be remembered that King was always engaged in amorous Intrigues, and had eleven Natural Children, besides those whom he would not, or could not well own; and then 'twill be easie to guess what kind of Ministries those were which raised *Varenne*.

Id p. 543.

* *Thuan.* lib.
132. p. 1122.

† See his Ora-
tion at large,
ibid. p. 1123.

This dexterous Courtier was the man that prevailed with the King to restore the Jesuits, notwithstanding the earnest * Intercessions of the Parliament of *Paris*, who oppos'd the Edict of their reestablishment, and the convincing Reasons of † *Achilles de Harlay*, first President, against it. But the King being absolutely fixed in his resolution, the Parliament therefore were forced to verifie the Edict; and so at length it passed with a great many restrictions upon the Jesuits in it, which were never observed.

served by them. And the year following, at the instance of Father Cotton, the Pyramid was demolished on which the Decree of their Banishment was Engraven. Mezeray makes these remarks upon it: To take away, says he, the brand-mark from the forehead of the Society, they must pull down that Monument, which taught men to curse that Hellish Parricide: It was desir'd it might have been done by a Decree of Parliament; but when they found the sentiments of that great Company were quite contrary, they did it without further application to them: Tho not without giving the world a just occasion to speak variously concerning it. In the place of that Pyramid they made a Conduit or Fountain, all whose streams of water tho clear and plentiful, shall never be able to wash away the memory of so horrid a crime.

Anno 1610. that murder which was so often attempted, was at length by that bloody Villain Ravallac effected. The Author of *Anti-Cotton*, Chap. 3. has laid together a great many circumstantial proofs, which amount to at least a presumptive evidence, that the Jesuits were not innocent in it. And what he has collected, is not only for the most part confirmed in the French Histories, but much stronger circumstances are added to heighten the suspicion of their guilt: As to the seditious Preaching before the King's death, and the * Confession of Ravallac himself, that he was incited to this Villany by the Sermons of the Preachers; what our Author has related, is sufficiently attested by Thouan. As to the reports which were given out of the King's death, as a thing certain before it came to pass; I shall here insert what Mezeray has delivered. † It is most certain, that there were more than one single Conspiracy against this good King; his enemies had forg'd so many, that it was very improbable, if not impossible he should escape. They look'd upon his death as a thing so certain in foreign Countries, that there came news of it from Spain to France, that they published it in Milan almost a month before: That several Merchants in the Low-Countries writing to their Correspondents in Paris, desired to be inform'd whether the report was true. And that the 8th of May, whereas he was killed the 14th, a Courier passed through Liege, and bawled aloud, That he was going to carry the news to the Princes of Germany. Was it, adds he, that they thought to intimidate him therewith, and would imploy their menaces before they would proceed to execution? ‡

Thuan. lib. 134.
p. 1189.
Pag 908.

* Hist. Contin.
lib. 3 p. 78.
Quarrentibus
nonnullis quid
ipsum ad hoc
facinus impu-
lisset, respon-
dit, conciones
quas audivi,
ex quibus di-
dici quare ne-
cessarium est
Regem è me-
dio tolli.

† Pag. 940.
‡ See what is
cited by Fou-
lis, p. 642. out
of the History
of Henry le
Grand, by
Hardouin de
Perefix A.B.
of Paris, p.
939.

This is also related by Foutis out of the Memoirs of the Duke of Sully, p. 64.

Pag. 542.

Ibid.

Ibid p. 77.

The same Author tells us, that (not three months before the murder), *Those that were tainted with the Treason of the old League, endeavour'd to patch up a new one. And it was said the foundations of it were laid at la Fleische (in the Colledg of the Jesuits) for a woman affirm'd she had seen in an house where they kept many Scholars, certain Registers, which many had subscrib'd with Signatures of blood. And that the same persons who contriv'd this League, were also the contrivers of the Parricide it self, and did prepare and discipline Ravillac for the execution of it, the same Historian does plainly enough inform us, tho he does not mention the name of Jesuits: Those, says he, that premeditated to rid themselves of the King, finding this Instrument so proper to act their design, knew very well how to confirm him in his sentiments; they had people at their beck who haunted him eternally, tho he knew not their intents; who caused him to be instructed by their DOCTORS, and enchanted him with supposed Visions, and other like Diabolical arts. There are proofs that they carried him as far as Naples, where in an Assembly in the Vice-Roy's Palace, he met with many others, who had all devoted themselves to the same end. In fine, they managed and guided him so well to their purpose, that by his sacrilegious hand they perpetrated the detestable resolutions of their own wicked and accursed hearts. And then he proceeds to relate the manner how that Tragical act was perform'd, and adds this very remarkable passage. There were two things then observed from which the Reader may draw what consequence he pleases: The one, that when they had taken the Assassin, seven or eight men were seen to come up with their drawn swords, who cried aloud, he ought to be cut in pieces presently, and then immediately shelter'd themselves in the crowd. The other, that he was not presently put into Goal, but into the hands of Montigny, where they kept him two days in the Hostel de Roux, with so little care, that all sorts of people spake with him; and among others, a Religious person, who had great obligations to the King, having accosted him, and called him, My Friend, said to him, he should have a care of accusing honest people. Our Author affirms, that this Religious person was Cotton, and his Answerers confess that Cotton made a visit to him; But Moxeray, tho 'tis plain he meant him, durst go no further than a hint. Thuanus reflecting on the reports disseminated about the King's death, makes this judg-*

judgment of it: That if the many conspiracies against the person of this Prince be well considered, no one can doubt, but this last was forged in the same shop in which the others were framed. And then he gives a compendious account of several Plots against him, and particularly that of *Chastel*, for which the Society was banish'd. He seems indeed chiefly to aim at *Spain* in this reflection. But 'tis well known that the Jesuits were then always engaged in the *Spanish Plots*, and were the chief workmen in their Forges.

'Tis further observ'd by the same *Tbuanus*, that *Ravillac* had been thoroughly instructed in the Doctrine of killing Kings, tho he was grossly ignorant in all other points of Divinity; and in all his Answers to the Interrogatories of those who were deputed to examin him, he defended himself with the Maxims of *Marians*, and other Jesuits, that assert the lawfulness of killing Kings, and was well skill'd in all their solutions and distinctions. He freely confess that the reason why he resolv'd to kill the King, was, Because being addicted to the Reformed Religion, he had not reduced the *Hugonots* to the *Romish Faith*; and that he was confirm'd in this resolution, by hearing that the King design'd to wage War against the Pope, because this was to fight against God; For the Pope was God. He also voluntarily confess, That he had insinuated his design to *F. Aubigny a Jesuit*, shewing him a Knife, on which a Heart and a Cross was engraven, and saying withal, that the heart of the King ought to be mov'd to a War with the *Hugonots*. This Confession came freely and readily from him; and when it was read over to him, he persisted in it, and subscribed it. And when afterwards the Jesuit was brought to him, he affirm'd the same things to his face before the Commissioners. But *Aubigny* replied, it was all false; and that after so detestable a fact, he ought not to accuse any one falsely, and so aggravate his crime. This was such another hint as *F. Cotton* had given him before; and *Ravillac* immediately took it, and declar'd he had nothing to say against him; that he esteem'd him to be a good and a pious man, and believed what he said to be true.

It is to be observed, that when † *Barriere* was convinced by some Divines of the horrible impiety of murdering Kings, and so was brought to repentance; He confess'd that those who excited

Ibid 73. E. and 85. D.

Ibid. 78. A.

Ibid. 79. D.

Ibid. B.

Ibid. p. 81. E.

† *Tbuan*: lib. 107. p. 385.

* See what is
cited by Fou-
lis out of
Hard. de Pe-
refix to this
purpose, 642.

cited him to that villany, assur'd him, that if he should perish in the attempt, his soul would be carried by Angels into eternal bliss. But without caution'd him, That if he should be taken and tortured to confess his Complices, he should not discover them, because he would be certainly damn'd eternally for it. * It is very likely that the DOCTORS who had the tutoring of Rawllac, had prepossessed and fortified him with those necessary perswasions; and then (if it be considered that such perswasions have often made Villains suffer with as much resolution as Martyrs) it is no extraordinary thing that this Assassin should with such an invincible obstinacy undergo all the most exquisite tortures that could be invented to force a discovery from him, and persevere to the very last to deny that he had any Complices in his Villany.

** Thuan. Hist.
Cont. p. 101.

Eudæmon to vindicate the Jesuits from the suspicion of this Murder, and to shew that neither the Wife nor Son of Henry the 4th thought them Conscious of it, produces an Edict of Lewis the 13th made in his minority, by the direction of the Queen Regent; wherein a very favourable Character is given of the Jesuits, and their reestablishment further confirm'd. But this is really no more than their own testimony for themselves: For the Jesuits * were then predominant at Court, and during all this Regency, carried all before them; They had got the keeping of the Queens heart, as well as that of the Murdered King; And knew well enough how to use it to their own advantage. And to this absolute power of the Jesuits, is the condemnation of Anti-Cotton urged by Eudæmon, p. 44. to be ascrib'd. In that juncture it was not difficult to get that book condemn'd, and it was their interest to suppress an Author that wounded them so deeply. They would have dealt with him as || Mexeray says, a certain Damoiselle, named Anne de Comans was dealt with, who had before the Kings death given notice of a horrible conspiracy against him; and after he was dead, persisted in it; but they pretended she was mad, and shut her up. The Historian thereupon complains, I that the juncture of those times, and the too great importance of the subject have wholly suppress'd many strange things. And 'twas but necessary to suppress them, if that were true which he says many believed, that the Instruments of this execution were in the bosom of France, and even hid in the Royal Family.

|| See what
Foulis cites
out of the
same de Pere-
fix to this
purpose, p. 643

The Apologist of the Jesuits urge further the improbability of their attempting any thing against the life of a Prince, that was so great a friend to their Order; and that if they could be supposed so wicked, they could not be imagined so destitute of common prudence, as to destroy their greatest Patron and Benefactor. But to unfold this mystery: 'Tis only necessary to observe these three things. 1. That † the King had formed vast † *Mexeray*, p. 916, 935, 940. designs against *Spain* and the house of *Austria*; had amassed a vast treasure, and rais'd a great Army to execute them. This struck directly at the interest of the whole Society, which were then inseparably link'd to those of *Spain*, and therefore they were concerned by any means to prevent designs so pernicious to them.

2. The Catholics suspected that he was not firm to their Religion. It was well enough known, * that Politick arguments had the greatest share in his conversion, and that the Catholics threatening to dissent him, if he would not turn, made him see the absolute necessity of it. And therefore there was reason to suspect the sincerity of it. † *Thuanus* affirms, that after † *Ibid.* p. 99. his defection to the Roman Religion, he still retain'd the seeds of that persuasion in which he had been educated. His entering into a League with the Protestant Princes, gave them some umbrage, and anew holy League was thereupon projected by the Jesuits against him. And it is, lastly, certain, that whatever the King's designs were, *Ravillac* was fully perswaded by those that had the management of them, that his aim was to ruin his Holiness, and the Roman Religion, and this was the cause that instigated that Devilish Zealot to destroy him.

3. After his death the Jesuits were so far from being losers by it, that they became Masters of all their designs. Edicts were often published in favour of them. The conditions with which their restitution was clog'd, were rescinded; and it soon appear'd that the University of *Paris* would not be able to maintain their ground against them. And accordingly their long contests with that University were at length ended as themselves would have it. And the State-intrigues too, succeeded as well as they could desire. *Mexeray* tells † *pag.* 933. us, That after the King's death, the Court wholly changed its face, the Government its Maxims, the Ministers their designs.

The

A Vindication of Anti-Cotton,

The Orders which Henry the Great had established, were reversed, his Oeconomy dissipated, his faithful servants turn'd out of doors, and his Alliances forsaken to take up new ones; so that France, which was so lately triumphant, saw her self reduc'd under the Government and direction of Spain, and the Agents of the Court of Rome, who were the Oracle of the Regency. So that 'tis evident the Interests of Rome and Spain, and the whole Society, thriv'd by the King's death, no less than those of the Order in France. And that Butchery of him, as it was agreeable to their Principles, so it was very serviceable to their Designs.

Thus far have I endeavour'd to justify the truth of the most important passages related by *Anti-Cotton*; and now I shall consider briefly those in which *F. Cotton* himself, who gave occasion to this Treatise by his Declaratory Letter, was peculiarly concern'd.

Anti-Cotton p. 38. recites the Story of *F. Cotton's* consulting a Demoniack about the life of the King, and several other affairs. *Thuanus* gives a much larger account of this passage, and agrees exactly with our Author in it. His Apologism endeavour to excuse him, by saying that he only put some odd questions to the Dam'sel to discover whether she was really possessed. But what occasion was there then to enquire about the King's life? Was this a proper Interrogatory to find out a Devil by? Or was it only to trapan the evil spirit into a discovery of himself, that he asked such questions as these, *Which was the best Text of Scripture to prove Purgatory, and the Invocation of Saints? What God would permit the spirit to reveal to him about Confession, Vows, Cases of Conscience, and the conversion of Souls? What advantage might be had from the conversion of the King? What Hereticks were most likely to be converted? When the Heresie of Calvin should be extinguished? Why Geneva was so often preserved? And what Plots the Devils were hatching against the Jesuits?* This consulting the Devil as an Oracle, is, I think, worse than *Luther's* pretended disputing with him. But a Jesuit must be allow'd to puzzle and confound the Devil: And I believe a more impossible task was never put upon him, than to prove Purgatory, and Saint-Worship by Scripture.

Anti-

By *Anti-Cotton* we have an account of a Conspiracy discover'd by *Monsieur de la Forze*, and stifled by *F. Cotton*. *Thuanus* Hist. Con. tells us only that *de la Forze* discover'd some design against the King three years before he was assassin'd. But he gives no account of the particulars. And 'tis probable *Father Cotton's* being concern'd in it, was the reason of his silence. P. 77. B.

He charges *Cotton* with discovering the Kings secrets to the *Spanish Provincial*. This correspondence with *Spain* was then the subject of a *Pasquin* upon him. And *Foulis* says, that the Duke of *Sully* prov'd to the King that in that he was guilty, as himself affirms in his *Memoirs*. P. 644.

He reflects on *Cotton* for being a Courtier, a thing contrary, not only to the Institution of Monks, but particularly to the Rules of the *Jesuits*. To this the *Apologist* replies, That the *Jesuits* are not Monks; and therefore not obliged to the retirements of such; that their Rules bind them to live any where for the good of their Neighbour; and that they frequent Princes Courts to preserve them from Heresie. But 'tis evident *F. Cotton's* business at Court was not merely to take care of the King's Religion. He was not only his Confessor, but also one of his chiefest States-men; and therefore this can be no Apology for him. But it seems there is no other way to secure Religion at Court, but by posting *Jesuits* there; and they are the fittest men to preserve Kings from Heresie, who know what to do with them when they are inclining to it, that is, to poyson or stab them.

The I Constitutions of the *Jesuits* do expressly forbid them to meddle with Secular Affairs, or to suffer themselves to be busied in them. And *Anno 1593**, there was a Decree made by a General Congregation at *Rome*, That no *Jesuit* should busie himself in the State-affairs of Princes: And that he should not presume or dare to undertake the management of such

* *Hespin* Histor. Jesuitica. p. 89. præcipitur omnibus in virtute sanctæ obedi-

entia, ne quispiam publicis & secularium principum negotiis ullâ ratione se immiscere, nec etiam quantumvis per quoscunque requisitus aut rogatus ejusmodi res tractandæ curam suscipere audeat vel præsumat, idque serio commendatur superioribus, ne permittant Sociis istis rebus ullo modo implicari; & si quos ad ea propensos animadverterent eos loco mutandos, quamprimum commurent, si alicubi occasio vel periculum sit se ejusmodi implicationibus irretiendi.

matters, though never so much press'd and importuned to it, and Superiors are advis'd that if they observe any one forward to entangle himself in such matters, to remove him to a place where he may have no opportunity or temptation to it.

How well the Jesuits have observed these Constitutions, the whole world can witness. And whether they were at all intended to oblige, themselves can tell us. But the glory of God, and the good of their Neighbour are, they say, the principal ends of their Society; and for the promoting of these, all their Subordinate Rules may be dispensed with. And hence it is, that they who vow the strictest poverty, can yet become the Proprietors of all things, and have a greater revenue than ever Kings and Emperors. Hence they can be made Archbishops and Cardinals for the good of the Church; though by a special Vow they are excluded all Dignities and Benefices in it; and so though they are forbidden to be concerned in Secular Affairs, yet for the good of their Neighbour they can become Merchants, Bankers, and Monopolizers; and for the good of Kingdoms become Counsellors and Ministers of State, though they are peremptorily forbidden to intermeddle in State-Affairs.

R: 54.

† Hist. Cont.

R: 95.

* Pag. 908.

He reproaches Cotton for conniving at the King's pleasures, nay encouraging and assisting him in the pursuit of them; and for some private Amorous intrigues of his own. As for his conniving at the King's Amours, 'tis plain the Portuguese Father mention'd by Anti-Cotton, did publicly tax him for it; as may be seen in that part of his Discourse which † Thuanus has inserted in his Characters of Henry the Fourth; to shew that the King's Favourites did sooth and flatter him in his Vices. And * Mazaray does covertly insinuate the same reflection: When, says he, Father Cotton was made Confessor to the King, all good men did rejoyce, imagining he could shew no connivance for the King's Amours, but that he would make use of the power of his Ministry, which certainly was most necessary, to cure him of an infirmity that was become habitual. The Historian adds, that he wanted no qualities to make him successful in his Sphere: But his circumspection, his complaisance and dexterity to lay hold of time and opportunity,

were

were employed to insinuate himself into the King's favour, and of times into his very bosom, and most retir'd thoughts.

To the passages of Cotton's own private Amours, the Apologist produces several Certificates from *Avignon* and *Nismes* to contradict them; and to give Testimonies of his great Holiness and Piety. It may be our Author as to these particulars was wrong informed concerning the Father; but what credit is to be given to such Certificates, I leave every one to judge. It was not difficult for the Jesuits, who were then so powerful, to procure what Certificates they pleased. And the great commendations they give of his Piety (of which his consulting the Devil is an irrefragable Testimony) may make one suspect the truth of all they affirm. But the Apologist himself does furnish me with an answer to them; for he rejects the appeal of *Anti-Cotton* to *Monsieur des Bordes*, because he was a Protestant; and we have the same right to reject his Testimonials, because subscribed by Jesuited Catholicks.

It remains now only to add something concerning that which was the chief design of the Author of this Paper; namely, To represent the Jesuits as a Society whose Principles and Practices tended to the subversion of the publick Peace, and the overthrow of all the Foundations of Government. This he has made good by appealing to the Books of their approved Authors, the Rebellions and Assassinations they fomented in *France*, their Plots and Conspiracies against *England*, and the great Com-motions they had raised in *Poland*, *Transylvania*, and *Venice*; he might have added *Portugal*, *Hungary*, and the Empire of *Germany* also.

And this Charge, as odious as it is, may be abundantly verified out of the Historians, and other Writers of their own Religion.

In short, there is nothing more certain in History, than that this Society, ever since the Institution of it, have been hurtful to Kings and Provinces, have raised Insurrection and Sedition, and turn'd the world upside down.

And there is no reason to imagine that the present Members of it are better than their Fore-fathers, or that they will not still walk on in the beaten Paths of their Predecessors. As for us Protestants, the Jesuits have always esteem'd it their greatest Glory, that they have been our greatest and most implacable Enemies; and that they have done more Service to the Catholick Cause against us, than all the other Orders and Ecclesiasticks of their Church.

* *Alphonsus de Vargas*, c. 8. p. 20. Germ. Jesuitæ in iustâ defensione sui Monarchos irridunt qui Apostolos imitati Verbi prædicatione & viæ Sanctimonii Hæreticos ad Ecclesiæ Communionem reducere conantur. Istius enim modi non nisi inter Ethnicos usum esse aliquem; Hæreticos verbè Edictis, minis, atque etiam pœnis compelli oportere; hic optimus est Hæreticos convertendi modus.

* A Spanish Writer informs us, *That the German Jesuits, in a Printed Apology, deride and scoff at those that in Translation of the Apostles endeavour to convert Hereticks, by preaching of the Word unto them; affirming, That there was some use indeed of preaching in converting Pagans; but that Hereticks ought to be compell'd by Edicts, Threats*

and Punishments; and that this was the best way of converting Hereticks. These are the Methods which the Jesuits have always reli'd on, as the most efficacious means of reducing us to their Religion; and have never failed, when opportunity served to put them in Practice. And so outrageous has their Malice been, that some of them have plainly assur'd us, that we are never to expect any Quarter from them; and that, however to promote the Catholick Cause, they may vouchsafe to Treat and Capitulate with us; yet, when such Capitulations become prejudicial to it, then they must without scruple be broken, and Faith must not be kept with Hereticks against the Church. *Becanus* has honestly told us, *That all Laws and Compacts which give Liberty to every Man to be Catholick, Lutheran or Calvinist, are in themselves unlawful, and repugnant to the Divine Will, and are not but for some time*

Apud. Hospin. ex Disp. de fide hæreticis servanda, l. 10. p. 87.

sequ. Asserit libertatem sive pactionem illam religionis, quæ liberum permittitur esse Catholicum vel Lutheranum, vel Calvinistam, omnino esse illicitam & Divino præcepto repugnantem, nec aliter quam aliquo tempore majoris damni vitandi causa, tolerari posse. P. 94. Imo hæc libertas à Catholicis omnibus modis quantum commode fieri potest, impediri & profigari debet. Nullus sit istis Ministeriorum locus: Sciamus omnes, etiam quod speciali rescripto vel pacto ab huiusmodi hominum genere imperatum sit, non va-

to be tolerated to avoid a greater Evil; nay, such a Liberty must by all means be hindered and destroyed by Catholicicks. Let the Hereticks, adds he, have no License to exercise their Religion; and let all Men know, that if any such License be granted by special Patts and Edicts, it is not valid. There may be other Jesuits produced, that have taught the same Doctrine, tho it may be not so plainly. And 'tis evident, that they who believe that Subjects may be absolv'd from their Fidelity to Heretical Princes (which is the known Doctrine of the Jesuits) must reciprocally believe that Princes may be likewise absolv'd from all Obligations of Fidelity to Heretical Subjects. But tho they have not always openly owned this Doctrine, yet 'tis certain they have always practic'd it: And Protestants have been always convinc'd by sad Experience, that where-ever this Society has been Predominant, their Pacifications, Edicts, Compacts, and the most solemn Promises and Engagements have proved no better than Cobwebs to shelter and protect them; and have only served as Duckoys, to draw them into their Nets, and trapan them into Destruction. But Treachery foreseen, is half prevented; and open War is not near so dangerous as an insidious Peace. F. Campian has long since in the name of all his Order, publicly proclaim'd irreconcilable War against us: Know, says he, that as for our Society, all of us, who are dispersed far and wide throughout the World, of whom there is a perpetual Succession, and an infinite number have entred into a Holy League; and as long as any one of us remain, will never break off our Endeavours and Designs about your Salvation (for that was his Cant for extirpating the pestilent Northern Heresy) the method of accomplishing it, is long since resolved on, and the Battel begun, and no Force, no Efforts of the English shall overcome us. This was a brave and gallant Enemy; and tho he himself ingloriously perish'd in this War at Tyburn; yet this did not discourage the rest of his Society, from carrying it on with.

*Camp. in concertatione Ec. Cath. Trevi-
vis excusa apud Hospin. p. 22. Anno 1533.
Quod ad Societatem nostram attinet,
omnes qui per totum orbem longe lateque
diffusi sumus, quorum est continua succe-
ssio, & magnus numerus, Sanctum foedus in-
iisse, nec quamdiu vel unus nostrum supere-
rit, studium & consilia nostra de salute ve-
stra intermissuros; jam pridem inita ratio-
est & inchoatum certamen, nulla vis, nullus
Anglorum impetus superabit.*

with invincible Obstinacy, in spite of all those many Defences which Providence has given them; and so they have brought it down to us of this Generation, to be convey'd to those who come after us, till the Providence of God (whose Counsels are unsearchable) shall destroy the Enemies of *Sion*, and restore Peace to *Jerusalem*. And blessed be that over-ruling Providence of God, who hath so often delivered this Church from the greatest dangers, and doth deliver, in whom we trust that he will yet deliver us.

FINIS.
